

**Janice K. Brewer**  
Governor

**Bill Feldmeier**  
Interim Executive Director



Board Members

**Walter D. Armer, Jr.**, Vail, *Chair*  
**Maria Baier**, State Land Commissioner, *Vice Chair*  
**Alan Everett**, Sedona  
**Larry Landry**, Phoenix  
**William C. Scalzo**, Phoenix  
**Tracey Westerhausen**, Phoenix  
**Reese Woodling**, Tucson

**MINUTES OF PUBLIC MEETING**  
**of**  
**THE OFF-HIGHWAY VEHICLE ADVISORY GROUP**  
**(OHVAG)**  
**of**  
**THE ARIZONA STATE PARKS BOARD**

Notice is hereby given pursuant to A.R.S. §41-511.22 to members of the Off-Highway Vehicle Advisory Group (OHVAG) and the general public that the Group will hold a meeting open to the public on **Thursday, December 1, 2011, at the Arizona State Board Room, 1300 W. Washington St., Phoenix, AZ at 10:00 a.m.**, pursuant to A.R.S. § 41-511.22. **Attendance via teleconference is available by dialing 1.877.820.7831 and entering the code number 613038.** The Group may go into Executive Session for the purpose of obtaining legal advice from the State Parks Assistant Attorney General on any of the agenda items pursuant to A.R.S. § 38-431 et seq. Items on the Agenda may be discussed out of order, unless they have been assigned a time certain. Public comment will be taken. The Group will discuss and may take action on the following matters:

**(The Chair reserves the right to set the order of the agenda.)**

**A. CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL**

**CHAIR SAVINO:** I call to order the Off-Highway Vehicle Advisory Group on this Thursday, December 1, 2011 at 10:06 a.m. I'd like to do roll call.

**B. INTRODUCTION OF MEMBERS AND STAFF**

**CHAIR SAVINO:** I am John Savino, Chairman, Member-at-Large.

**MR. ROGERS:** Hank Rogers, Apache County ATV Rough Riders.

**CHAIR SAVINO:** Pete?

**MR. PFEIFER:** I'm Pete Pfeifer. I represent the American Motorcycle Association and the Trial Riders of Southern Arizona. (Via phone)

**CHAIR SAVINO:** Thomas.

**MR. McARTHUR:** Thomas McArthur, representing Coconino Trial Riders and Arizona Motorcycle Riders Association. (Via phone)

**NOTE:** David Moore, representing Arizona Elk Foundation joined the meeting later.

**CHAIR SAVINO:** Thank you, that's all. We have a quorum of members for the OHVAG. Now I'd like to have the State Parks staff be recognized.

**MR. ZIEMANN:** I'm Jay Ziemann, Assistant Director.

**MS. PULSIFER:** Doris Pulsifer, Chief of Resources & Public Programs.

**AAG HERNBRODE:** Joy Hernbrode, Attorney General's Office.

**MR. BALDWIN:** Robert Baldwin, Recreational Trails Grants Coordinator.

**MS. BAHL:** Renee Bahl, Executive Director.

**CHAIR SAVINO:** Okay, one little thing before I start to there. I'm going to say,

**"The Statewide OHV Program Mission is to develop and enhance statewide off-highway vehicle recreation opportunities, and develop educational programs that promote resource protection, social responsibility, and interagency cooperation.**

With that said, I'm going to move on to the Call to the Public.

### **C. CALL TO THE PUBLIC**

**CHAIR SAVINO:** The first person I would like to recognize is the Director of the State Parks, Renee Bahl.

**MS. BAHL:** Good morning, Mr. Chairman, members of the group. I stand here today to thank you for all the work that you have done and for all the volunteer hours you have put in to help improve our Off-Highway Vehicle Program in the State of Arizona. Many of you may know that I have resigned my position here as Executive Director. I have accepted another job in Santa Barbara County as the Assistant County Manager. It was a very difficult decision; but I think Arizona State Parks – I know Arizona State Parks and its programs are on strong grounds now and they're on the right path and this is a good time for a transition; and a good opportunity for me, personally, as well.

But mostly I wanted to talk to you about one of the strengths that we have. I talked to the Board and we had a number of constituents at our board meeting yesterday. One of the strengths we have at Arizona State Parks is our groups of interests and our constituents. That is the only reason that this agency continues to function – because of this public support that we have. Whether it's something as finite and definitive as an Off-Highway Vehicle Program or something as broad or something as just supporting natural, cultural and recreational resources in the state; it's been the people of this state who have kept us moving forward.

So, I wanted to tell you to not give up. Our Off-Highway Vehicle Program is very important. We do value your advice and your expertise; and the Board looks forward to continuing to work with you in a very difficult partnership. So I thank you, Mr. Chairman, and all the members of the OHVAG for everything.

**CHAIR SAVINO:** We'd like to thank on behalf of the OHVAG members – we'd like to thank you for your participation and your support of Off-Highway Vehicle use in the state. Thank you.

**MR. ROGERS:** Joy, am I outta line making a comment here – a public comment?

**AAG HERNBRODE:** Yeah.

**CHAIR SAVINO:** But go ahead and make it anyway.

**MR. ROGERS:** Thank you, Renee. We appreciate all you've done. We wish you the best out there. I don't know why you'd go to California from Arizona. I'll probably spend the rest of my life trying to figure that out.

[Laughter.]

**CHAIR SAVINO:** Pete

**MR. PFEIFER:** Renee, I just wanted to also wish you well.

**MS. BAHL:** Thank you, Pete.

**CHAIR SAVINO:** All right. Now I'm going to move on to – we're into the Call to the Public. But I want to make a reminder because we have several people out there:

"Consideration and acknowledgment of comments and suggestions from the public. Those wishing to address the group must register at the door and be recognized by the Chair. It is probable . . ." and it goes on from there – basically, what I'm saying is that you need to register at the door.

So if you haven't and given me a slip, then I can't go any further with you – recognizing you; but at this point what I'd like to do is I have the next person on this thing is Jeff Gursh. Mr. Gursh, would you like to take it and discuss it? We'll talk about it now. I may ask you when it comes to that topic that you're going to talk about – if you're going to talk about one of our topics – I will probably call on you again during that time. But I'd like to have you give us a brief overview of what you're discussing.

**MR. GURSH:** Mostly answering or asking questions during your comments on your item 1, the review of grants.

**CHAIR SAVINO:** Okay.

**MR. GURSH:** If that's possible. If I could save my comments for when you actually talk about –

**CHAIR SAVINO:** Great, that sounds good! That's okay with me. All right, with that said, are there any more out there that I haven't gotten?

[No verbal response.]

**CHAIR SAVINO:** I'm moving on. We're moving over – we changed a few things up. I have the right to change this as we go. Because of the time constraints and everything like that, I'm going to put in first on the agenda this chart, this flowchart. "OHVAG will consider and approve a draft OHV Project Evaluation form." Doris, do you have a presentation for us on that?

## **F. OHVAG ACTION ITEMS**

**2. OHVAG Will Consider and Approve a DRAFT OHV Project Evaluation Form.** – At the request of one of the OHVAG members, staff has developed a project evaluation form

that provides a quantitative analysis of projects based on the priorities for project selection identified in the off-highway vehicle statute A.R.S. §28-1176(E-H) and the State Trails Plan. OHVAG may suggest additions, deletions and/or changes to the form and will determine how and if it will be used in the project selection process. The discussion may include recommendations on project application requirements and considerations for funding future projects, such as a maximum project award and proof of user community support.

**MS. PULSIFER:** Mr. Chairman, if I could clarify; you're not changing the agenda, you're just changing the order.

**CHAIR SAVINO:** I'm changing the order of the agenda.

**MS. PULSIFER:** Skipping ahead to item –

**CHAIR SAVINO:** Okay, do we have others? Okay, prior to that – hang on a second, Doris. He's got some slips in his hand. Bob? I have two members of the audience who would like to speak and I just wanted to clarify on record where they want to put this. This is in regard to the Ambassador stuff; so do you want to wait until then? Or do you have a comment or statement you'd like to say right now?

**SPEAKER:** I'll wait.

**CHAIR SAVINO:** I'll have you wait until the Ambassador thing. And Tom Palmer? Is this in regards to one of your requests here?

**MR. PALMER:** I'm just here to listen.

**CHAIR SAVINO:** Great, then, you don't have anything to say. Okay. Great! I've got that outta the way. Let's go on to item – I'm sorry, Doris, go back to agenda item number 2. "OHVAG will consider and approve a draft OHV Project Evaluation form."

You guys – Pete and Tom, do you have your evaluation form handy?

**MR. PFEIFER:** Yeah.

**CHAIR SAVINO:** Thomas?

**MR. McARTHUR:** No, I do not.

**CHAIR SAVINO:** Okay, then you're just going to have to – but you have reviewed it, though, right?

**MR. McARTHUR:** Yes, I have and I'll just follow along.

**CHAIR SAVINO:** Okay.

**MS. PULSIFER:** Mr. Chairman and members of OHVAG if you recall back in September I kind of did an overview of this; and it's a humongous chart here. We can only look at it in little pieces here. Again, don't pay attention to these numbers. This is kind of an example of how it will work. So these aren't actually suggestions. It was something that we were kind of internally messing with to see how it would look to give you an idea.

As we discussed in September, and hopefully you've had a chance to kind of in between time to look at it to see if there were any changes. These are suggestions. They're not written in stone. They're based on the statewide trails plan's priorities and the requirements – the statutory requirements. That's how we came up with these different categories. I'll go over them real quick, just as a review. What I did was I took – if you remember in the statewide trails plan, it's broken up into three priority components. I tried to capture those three components and I put them here, starting with the first-level priorities; and assigned some rating to each one of them. My goal at the time was to try to get to 100 for total points. That's why I've got eight in here. As we go along you'll see how they all add up to 100 points.

Anyway, the first-level priority component will have your highest points. Each component will be worth eight points. The second level would be worth less – and I assigned four points. Again, these are all the different components in the second-level priority. As we go along there's a third-level priority component. These, of course, would be worth the least amount. But they're all important components. It's just that they're first, second and third-level priorities. So the total possible base points would be 52 points if we used this numbering structure.

The second part of this was dividing it up into another section where we've got four categories for bonus points. This is to try and capture where the statute says that priority should be given to projects that have components in more than one priority. So in this first category I assigned the most points. Altogether you could get 25 points. You could actually get points in each or – in both or in each of these sections. So if any of your points in the first section – if you had points in any of your first section you would get 15 points. If you had any points in your second priority section, you would automatically get 10 points. Then in the third priority – we're trying to assign points to projects that have items – scope items that are either in your first or second-level priorities; because those are your highest priorities.

Then the second priority is whether they have more than – the more components that they have the better the project – the more needs that they're addressing in the statewide trails plan. So if they – in category two you can get bonus points if you have – if the applicant has scored any points in at least three of the components. And it doesn't matter which priority level. As long as they had at least three components, they could get nine extra points. If they scored in at least two components they'd get five points. That's a way to get some extra points.

The third bonus category was if they had letters of support. I think you all indicated that these letters should be letters of support from OHVAG or OHV groups. So if they received up to three – you can get up to three points for each letter from individuals. The second section would be they can get up to three points for each group, up to six. So if they had letters in each section they could get up to nine points in this section.

The fourth bonus category allows OHVAG to set their own priorities. You've got the priorities in the statewide trails plan; but maybe within those priorities you as a group, OHVAG, identifies a priority because – you've got your five years from

when the statewide trails plan first goes into effect. Within that time, maybe some of the priorities may shift a little bit depending on the economy or whatever. So this allows OHVAG to identify what they feel they want to have as a priority in that cycle. And if you want to keep the same priority in future cycles you can do that. Or if you want to change – the economy changes and you feel like you may want to change that priority. That gives you that opportunity. So during that cycle the applicants know that they can get extra points for a priority that OHVAG has identified.

So there's an opportunity to receive a total of 48 points in the bonus categories. So, like I said, I was trying to reach 100 points and that's how I came up with this scoring structure. Now this is just an example. We can change these amounts. This kind of gives you an idea of how it would add up if we wanted to make 100 points total.

Then we get into the funds requested. Here we put in – staff would fill this part in as we receive the applications. We would enter at the beginning the name of the applicant, the project description; then we would enter what the amounts are that they're requesting and staff would determine whether it's eligible as OHV or whether it's eligible as RTP funds. Then in the pink section here – and again, this is something that you can change. I just used \$300,000 and \$500,000 as an example. I know that you've had some discussions about putting a cap on the amount of these projects. This is one way to do it.

Another way that you can do it is maybe assign a cap, for example, 20 percent of the total amount that's available – of funds that are available. That's another way that you can do it. But for this purpose I just used this as an example. An applicant that had an application that's over \$300,000, if it was an eligible application, they could receive 100 percent up to \$300,000. Then after \$300,000 – say their application was \$500,000, anything between \$300,000 and \$500,000, they would get 50 percent. Then after that, they would have to cover the rest. This is just so that, you know, you don't have an application that comes in and sweeps the whole amount that's available and doesn't leave very much for other projects. Again, these amounts are whatever you want them to be; and this just comes over to the total amount it comes out to be. Then the sponsor funds, of course, would be whatever is left. Whatever isn't going to be funded through grant funding would be the sponsor's responsibility. Then this is the total project there.

In the light green here, this gives you a running total so you can kind of keep track of – as you're assigning these, evaluating these projects you can kind of tell what's available – what you're starting with and as you approve these projects, you can see what the balance is so that you can kind of tell what you have left to work with. So that's how that works.

That's pretty much this example.

**CHAIR SAVINO:** Can we start discussing it then?

**MS. PULSIFER:** Go ahead.

**CHAIR SAVINO:** I'll start it. I like – I understand the need for this chart. It was asked for by an OHVAG member. We needed some way to capture all the different areas – aspects of how we're grading this. Okay? A couple of the questions that I've – I've talked to some of the members who aren't here on this and some of the questions that I have are – the comments that have come back, "Is this just another tool for State Parks to use to where we have a disagreement on a grant, what. . ." you know, as I said last time, OHVAG – when we get our grant packets we go out and we make phone calls. We call the coalition. We call different things. We go to the projects to see what's going on with those projects, to see what's needed, get with the different OHV groups in the area to see whether that is a good project or not that's worthy of – you know, to give them that money.

We take that into consideration. We take into consideration that we have X amount of dollars – which I love this last part of this where all the money is. This is great! We needed that. We have X amount of dollars. Now our responsibility is to spread it around the state. I don't see anything on here that has any mention of a consideration that we're giving – we have 15 grants we put out this year and 14 of them are for the Mesa Ranger District. That's not spreading it around the state. We have to take – there may be a great project and it may score high here. That doesn't necessarily mean that we want to push it through. It may come down low on the list. Because we see a project in an area – in Wickenburg or something – I'm just giving examples where – that hasn't got any money for a long time. Or Yuma, let's say, a Yuma, that hasn't gotten money for a long time. That we want to see if we want to promote that area there.

So there's no consideration of that at all in here.

**MS. PULSIFER:** You know one way that you maybe could address that is in that category four under the bonus. That could be one of your priorities that maybe you want to recognize or give points to a project that – in an area that is not – an area that's not being funded in another project. Maybe there's a way we could do it.

**CHAIR SAVINO:** Okay, and that is a good idea, but this is – another point I'm going to make is this: Our ratings – this tool is for us, for OHVAG, not for State Parks. But State Parks, we can't control if you use it – for your use – but it's for our use; yet if you go over to category four OHVAG's priorities is only five points in that. Okay? There are only five points in these sections. That should be more than – or equal to this consideration of this thing. Don't interrupt me because this is –

**MS. PULSIFER:** No, I'm not interrupting.

**CHAIR SAVINO:** You were shaking your head there. OHVAG's recommendation on this thing should weigh more than these others. We are using these tools. I just don't like the idea of the number system to do this. We need some point there.

**AAG HERNBRODE:** I think you're misunderstanding the numbers on that part.

**CHAIR SAVINO:** Okay.

**AAG HERNBRODE:** All that other stuff comes out of the statute. So somebody has to consider it.

**CHAIR SAVINO:** Right. No, we want to.

**AAG HERNBRODE:** I assume that you consider what the requirements of the statute are. But then you – the statute has given you some priorities you can't work around.

**CHAIR SAVINO:** But the statute – okay, let me interrupt you there. Because – let's go back. The second-level priority, okay, the first one: "Increase on-the-ground management presence and law enforcement." Yes the statute values that high; but it also takes into consideration that we've given \$1.4 million for law enforcement already to Game and Fish on this stuff. We consider that in there. Plus the other – you know the 12 or the 10 UTVs we've given them; and the Sheriff's Department we've given Razors and stuff. So we are giving out money to law enforcement. So maybe that should be – that numbering system, yes; it's a high priority, a second-level, maybe; but not in our minds, because we're already dishing out that money. The OHV, not we – the OHV community is already dishing out \$1.4 million to Game and Fish for that specific reason. So we have to take that into consideration.

**AAG HERNBRODE:** I don't want to argue with you. I'm just going to say again, you need to comply with the priorities and the requirements of the statute; and then you can consider other factors in addition to that.

**CHAIR SAVINO:** Okay.

**MR. PFEIFER:** May I make a comment?

**CHAIR SAVINO:** Go ahead. The Chair recognizes Pete Pfeifer.

**MR. PFEIFER:** First of all, I guess somebody from OHVAG requested this form. I'm just wondering who that person is and if this form is what they were looking for?

**CHAIR SAVINO:** David Moore was the – Pete, Dave was the one who requested that. I was a witness to that when he requested it.

**MR. PFEIFER:** We just need to circle back with Dave and ask, "Hey, is this what you were kind of looking for?" I wanted to applaud staff for putting this form together. You can tell they put an awful lot of thought into it. I understand that – I think it was Joy who was talking when she said we need to take into consideration the trails plans, projects and whatnot – I guess my question comes in, who puts that number in there? Is it OHVAG who took these projects and put their own numbers in there? Or is that something staff built in and then we only have that one portion of the form to fill out later on?

**CHAIR SAVINO:** Doris?

**MS. PULSIFER:** Are you talking about when you actually go to rate; or are you talking about the amounts assigned for each category?



**CHAIR SAVINO:** No, when we go to rate – I believe that’s what you’re saying, Pete. When we go to rate it, are we given a blank sheet and then –

**MS. PULSIFER:** Oh, okay. I think one of the ideas was that we would provide this form to OHVAG blank other than with the – of course, staff will fill in for you, you know, the project sponsor, the project title, the project description; and then we would fill in – and they don’t have to be in any kind of order. I mean, they could be in alphabetical order. They would just – we would put them in there and the amount they’re requesting. Then you could get this other part in here, blank. You know, you could each individually rate it. Then when we come back and we meet you can compare your ratings and discuss them and come to a consensus on the ratings.

**MR. PFEIFER:** That’s what David was probably looking for, a tool, to help us in the rating process and whatnot. If we’re just given total blank sheets and then we have to use our own interpretations of the State Trails Plan, you know, to put numbers in there and stuff like that, that would probably be helpful.

**MS. PULSIFER:** I think staff would probably want to do their own so that, you know, if there’s some discussion then we come back to OHVAG and we discuss if – if there are any differences, we discuss what those differences are. At the end we could concur.

**CHAIR SAVINO:** Okay, I’m going to go to – Hank has been antsy. Hank first.

**MR. ROGERS:** Number one, I think – part of my question has been answered here. This is simply a tool. This is not rating them and putting them into priority as to how they’ll be selected. That’s my concern. I think I want to reserve the right as OHVAG to get toe-to-toe, nose-to-nose, eyeball-to-eyeball and hammer these out. Use this as a tool only.

Now, to address Joy’s thing here from the statutory standpoint, there are several of us sitting in this room who helped put this law together. I don’t remember in the statute Joy anywhere where it says we have to prioritize anything. We have certain things that we can spend this money on. Jeff correct me, or Bill. Correct me if I’m wrong, but I don’t think that’s in the statute. I think it was – there are only certain things you can spend it on – and I may be wrong; but you know, my memory can serve me wrong here; but I don’t recall that. We didn’t put any type of priority on it.

**CHAIR SAVINO:** It states in the bill – I have the bill right here – what it says. Basically it’s recommending in the bill what you can use it for. It doesn’t say “priority” like Hank says.

**AAG HERNBRODE:** What it says is, you have to use the priorities that are in the State Trails Plan, which allows it to change as the needs of the State of Arizona change. So you look at the – everybody here – we do the trails plan. The needs of the State of Arizona change every five years; so it allows some flexibility within that scope of things.

**MR. ROGERS:** I’m talking about the actual law, Joy.

**AAG HERNBRODE:** The actual law says you shall use the priorities in the State Trails Plan. I'll show you.

**MR. ROGERS:** I want to see that one because I certainly don't remember that one.

**CHAIR SAVINO:** Yeah, I have the bill right here. While she's doing that I want to go on. Thomas, do you have any questions or concerns about this?

**MR. McARTHUR:** I have a comment. I want to say also thank you staff for putting this together. It's, I think, a very, very fine tool and will be very useful to us. I want to see this used as one of the tools in our arsenal to help evaluate and to keep it – and not rely simply on it to make decisions on the grant. But I think it's a wonderful tool that you've put together that we can use moving forward. I think there may be some adjustments here and there; but that's part of the process.

**MS. PULSIFER:** Well you know, keep in mind that this is meant to be a tool because as you evaluate and you get your priorities – you put them in priorities then you look at them as they fall as priorities. But there may be other things you may want to take into consideration. Once you see them in the priority order, doesn't necessarily mean that it's the best use of the money.

So, you may want to – after you see them in the priority order that they fall, you may have some other considerations. Then there's that last page that we didn't go into where you write those justifications. Say, "Yes, this project met the requirements, however, due to whatever circumstance, it was the consensus of OHVAG that this was not the best use of the money." Then you go to your partner and you ask your partner, "How can you mitigate this?" "Can you change something in this application to make it a better use of the money?" You know, something – use that as an example. See what I'm saying. This is just a tool.

**CHAIR SAVINO:** Okay, I'm going to recognize – Hank hold on a second. Real quick, then I'm going to go back to Hank.

The Chair recognizes that David Moore has entered the room and is taking part in this. You came at a good time. David we're on the subject of this chart. Okay. It was said by staff that you're the one who asked for this chart – a tool to help us out. After I go to Hank then I'm going to come to you to give us – because one of the things that was just questioned was – Pete asked who did this – who asked for it and was this his intention? Is this going in line with what you were asking?

Hank Rogers.

**MR. ROGERS:** I stand corrected. Thank you Joy and Bob for correcting me. But I also wanted to say, nice job, Doris. I think you've done a good job here. I'm sure we can go in and make some changes here and there that might help it be even a better tool as we move along with it, use it for the next few years. I think it's a great start! We'll probably find some things that will maybe make it better in time.

**CHAIR SAVINO:** Okay, the Chair would like to recognize – let me go to David Moore first. David, are you ready? Or you want me to give you half a second?

**MR. MOORE:** Give me just a second.

**CHAIR SAVINO:** Okay. The Chair recognizes Jeff Gursh. He has a comment on this.

**MR. GURSH:** A couple questions. One was, do the categories change each time you change your trails plan?

**MS. PULSIFER:** Yes because it has to. The whole rate – yeah, it has to be justified on the trails plan.

**MR. GURSH:** Would there be a minimum point score that a person would have to get to actually receive money? Let's say they had just one category and it would – they got maybe a tenth of the points available. Is there some minimum that you would be looking for? It would have to score at least this many points to even be eligible.

**CHAIR SAVINO:** Well, do we have – me – also on that thing, I'm gonna ask Doris – do we have – there's nowhere on this – we just rate them one to ten. There are ten grants and we rate them. We may have the nine and ten on there that we – I don't care what points they got, we decided not to do this for whatever reason. An example is Desert Wells. Okay? We decided we didn't want to push that through. We didn't have – with the old system we didn't have that ability to put down no. We just rated it nine and ten which left it open and that's where we came up with those problems we had.

**MR. ROGERS:** And I think that's my point, Jeff. This is a tool or a way to see – to look at the grants. Not to rate the grants or prioritize them or authorize the grants or anything else. That authorization of the grants comes from us raising our hands and us getting eyeball-to-eyeball and nose-to-nose and discussing. I think this is more of a tool. That's the way I want to see it. I do not want to see this become the thing that tells us whether that grant's going to be good or it's not – it's going to be accepted or not accepted. That's what I don't want to see. I want it left for us to raise our hands.

And I think, too, Joy that one of the things that needs to happen here is, you know, if the statute says one thing as the OHV Plan and we're talking about the Trails Plan. We need to bring those two concepts together so it's the same. You see what I'm saying?

**AAG HERNBRODE:** I think the – and correct me if I'm wrong, Doris – but I think the OHV Plan is a subset of the Trails Plan for the Motorized and the non-Motorized. The OHV Plan being the motorized.

**MR. ROGERS:** I would like that clearer, though, when we go forward with this because that's what confused me.

**CHAIR SAVINO:** All right, Jeff, one more thing.

**MR. GURSH:** The other one was, I know you don't require matches; but if a grantee is applying for a grant and he has money, there's no category here that gives him bonus points for bringing half the money for the project to the plan. So let's say I'm asking for a hundred and I have no money to match; or I'm asking for

a hundred and I have \$50,000 as a match, you should get some kind of bonus points for bringing money of your own into the project.

**MR. ROGERS:** I think that's a great point.

**CHAIR SAVINO:** Yeah, that's a great – we like that.

**MS. PULSIFER:** We can add another category in there.

**CHAIR SAVINO:** Okay, all right. I wanna get to David. David, will you please give us an overview of what you were asking for to start with?

**MR. MOORE:** Well, this comes very close. What I wanted was a comprehensive way to look at the things as a group and to see it. I agree 100 percent with what Hank said. This is not a tool where we rate them and then just do them. I think we had problems in the past because of that system. I think the final decision needs to be made by a vote of the group, yes or no, based on our discussion following our, you know, examination of these kind of things where we put it all together and look. It's just a way to more clearly see the relevant merits of each grant application. That's what I was looking for.

**CHAIR SAVINO:** Okay. How do we get around addressing this to the OHVAG members? How do we get around the aspect of having – where there is a disagreement on what we vote and State Parks has rated their system. They have the same tool and they go and they say, "Well, we don't agree with you." They take this to the Board and say, "Here we rated this project number one – all these points – and OHVAG has rated it way down." How do we get away from this? This is just a tool. Hank?

**MR. ROGERS:** My feeling is this, in this discussion, Bob, Jay, whoever represents State Parks, we need to know. When we vote on it, we need to know. Say we vote to approve Grant A and State Parks' staff is against it. You tell us in the OHVAG meeting. You know what, we as OHVAG members can show up at that State Parks Board meeting and get in our public comment and say, "Here's why we disagree with staff."

**CHAIR SAVINO:** Well that's what we're going to get into pretty quick.

**SPEAKER:** Wait I have a comment there.

**AAG HERNBRODE:** Who did you want to go first?

**CHAIR SAVINO:** Hang on. I would like Bob Baldwin to go first here. Hang on Pete.

**MR. BALDWIN:** First of all, let me explain a little bit about the grant situation. We offer grants under state statutes, which require us to do certain things in order to identify who should receive the money. This list just gives you a breakdown of all of the things that should be considered as far as, "Is this project eligible?" "Does it meet the requirements for the program?" et cetera, et cetera. You could put in the point amounts – whatever you want in there. Again, we told you that several times. It's up to you to decide. The first priority item should score more than second priority items, et cetera; and you have some discretion as far as identifying

points that can go to projects outside Maricopa or Pima County or whatever you want to say – and if they bring a match to the program, you can add that as far as the point situation is concerned.

The way we've been offering money over the last year through the Sticker Fund Program is we've been offering money to partners who we have agreements with in projects that you've reviewed and offered funding to. Again I remind you, projects are not now going to the Parks Board for approval. Once you approve them, they are done. All right, now, if there's a serious discrepancy where we might need to take something to the Parks Board that would be an extraordinary issue. But in moving forward, since we're going to offer money to non-agency partners who we do not have over-arching agreements with, we have to make the process meet the statute; which means, it has to be competitive.

You have to identify the criteria that you're looking for in the projects, which is all the stuff on that sheet. You have to tell the applicant how they're going to score when they submit their application. Then you have to judge the scores – you have to rate the projects according to that criteria. You can't wait for the projects to come in and say: "Oh, well we decided we like this kind of project better than this kind." You have to put it upfront in the application manual so that everybody knows that if they put this element in their project they're going to get eight points. If they put this element in their project they're going to get X points. If they can bring in a match they'll get these points. If they have support letters from their constituents they get these points. Once you add all those points up the highest points get offered first. If you want to cap that somewhere and say you have to get at least so many points to be funded you have to do that in advance. You can't sit there at the last minute and say, "All right, let's make the cap here at 80 points. Anybody who didn't get 80 points doesn't get funded."

So that's the reason for this process and this whole sheet is to have you right now before we write our grant manual and offer these grants to anybody who wants to apply for them, we need to decide what we're going to tell them to bring to the table; and that's what we're doing here today.

**CHAIR SAVINO:** Okay. Joy?

**AAG HERNBRODE:** Mr. Chairman, I'd like to take – I know you asked the question of OHVAG members but I'd like to answer your question because I think I answered it at your last meeting.

Say you go through here and you get numbers and State Parks has gone through and gotten the same numbers or slightly different numbers on grants then you decide that the third numbered project is really the most important one for some reason. You put in your motion as we discussed last time – I mean, put in your motion, "This is why we think this is the most important thing."

**CHAIR SAVINO:** That won't work, Joy. I know you mentioned this and we covered it last time. That won't work. We don't have enough time in the day to sit down – and if we have a motion and we take a vote and we have a motion that this project – specific project we don't recommend as a high project because of these reasons,

we'd have to sit there – I know myself. I'm not an attorney and I can't sit there and write all that stuff out that's going to go in front of the Board. That's why we want and what we had talked about with Renee is that we want when in a very – you know, it doesn't happen that often. When there is a disagreement between State Parks staff and OHVAG on a grant and how we're going to position these that OHVAG has allowed time – not ample time – okay, ample time – not the three minutes at a board meeting to discuss this. Where we can bring the coalition people or what have you to the board meeting to present it to the Board so they see the total picture on the thing.

**AAG HERNBRODE:** I'm not disagreeing that that's a wonderful strategy. I'm not saying that that's wrong or that that's not something you should do. What I'm saying is – because if I remember correctly when Doris plugged in the grants that you had just passed into this thing; they came out in roughly the same order as you – there were some models that were out, but they came out in basically the same order as you rated them.

So, the only time you have to have that explanation is where some grant is drastically out of order for some reason. That's the only time you have to do that. Otherwise the score sheet itself helps justify your answers to the Parks Board or to anybody else. But Bob is also right. Your applicants, people who are going to come in, need to have some idea ahead of time what you're looking for. Just for fairness. So if they need to go out like, you know, Jeff mentioned and get a match and that will get them some extra points; you need to tell them that ahead of time instead of showing up at the meeting and saying, "Wow, Jeff's got extra points. Nobody else thought of that."

**CHAIR SAVINO:** No, I agree 100 percent with that – what Bob was saying.

**AAG HERNBRODE:** You know, it might be really productive for you to think about making a list of the things that you think – let's set aside the statutory stuff right now. What is the other stuff for this next year you guys think is important. What's the best project you could have for next year, you know, is it outside Maricopa County or inside Maricopa County? Is it under \$300,000? Does it have a match?" Those kinds of things and make that list then you can attach points to it. Then that list can be your extra stuff.

**CHAIR SAVINO:** Okay, the Chair recognizes Pete. Did you have a comment? Are you still there?

**MR. PFEIFER:** Yeah I sure am. I'm trying to wrestle with some of this a little bit. You know for a State Trails Program to work you're going to need education, enforcement and litigation for OHV damage. You know, depending on the area, those priorities can shift between those three things. If we are now going to try and say for education you're going to get 10 points; enforcement you're going to get eight; mitigation, five? I'm not sure how well that's going to work in the different districts.

The other thing when staff and OHVAG disagree how to get equal time in front of the Board, I understood what Joy was trying to say; this is how the system works

and this is how you do that. It would be nice, just like John was trying to say, if there is a disagreement and we both get time in front of the Board at the same time to say, you know, this is OHVAG's reason why they voted, no, and this is staff's reason why they voted, yes, so they get a balanced picture.

**CHAIR SAVINO:** All right, thank you, Pete. Jeff Gursh.

**MR. GURSH:** Going back to Bob's comment about the score sheet being used because it has to go through a bid process. What I would ask would be that there would be that process for a nonprofit to apply for grant money and receive the money. If you still continue to use the process you have now for your partners like Forest Service or BLM so you don't have the money sit for long periods of time while you go through the bid process. So if you could keep it where it works both ways where you still have Tonto National Forest or anybody as a partner being able to come to the table with a grant and OHVAG approves it and it doesn't have to go back to the Parks Board, that would continue. The nonprofit part as you were talking Bob where it has to go out for bids, that's where the score sheet – that would actually be separate. Is that something that's possible?

**CHAIR SAVINO:** Bob?

**MR. GURSH:** Because we lose that quick moving of the shifting of money.

**CHAIR SAVINO:** Bob, what say you?

**MR. BALDWIN:** First of all, Mr. Chair, if we set up the grant process and use an evaluation based on the grants, OHVAG would be the rating team. Staff may or may not participate in the rating; but we would not give a separate rating from what you guys give. The rating – under the grant statute, the grants are rated according to the criteria. All right? So all that sheet does is say, "Yes, this project does this; yes, this project does this," and you're identifying exactly what Dave asked for, a quantitative analysis of what's in the project. Isn't that what you asked for?

**MR. MOORE:** Yes, it is.

**MR. BALDWIN:** All right, so the sheet does that. It says, "This project contains this element in it." It's up to the grant applicant in their application to explain how putting a culvert in a road mitigates damage for his renovation technique; or whatever that might be. Or why signage at a certain location is a mitigation so that's the process of the grants. They say, "I want money for this and this is going to accomplish this. According to your requirements and your application I should get X points for this." The argument is, does it do that or doesn't it? Do they get the eight points or don't they?

Once we bring the applications to you guys and you go through this process and you score them that's it. There is no staff review, there is no Board review. You recommend the funding based on your evaluation; but you have to be – follow the criteria in the program and you have to identify upfront and you have to acknowledge it when they provide it. So, these little intricacies you want to add at the end you have to identify those before you start.

**CHAIR SAVINO:** Bob, don't get me wrong. I want to have you – during this process when we rate it and we have the seven members rate it and we come up with our rating; I then want to have staff – if they don't – if they have other input on this, I want them at that – at the table. We're sitting here because I value your input and I want that. We may have overlooked something so we need that. But when it leaves here we should all be on the same page.

**MR. BALDWIN:** And that's exactly right. All we would do in this process is help you identify, based on what the applicant has submitted in their application, evaluate their commentary, their response to the criteria that says this is such-and-such an item; and we would assist you in identifying that. It would be your choice in the final run. Is this a mitigation item or is it not a mitigation item? If it is, they get X points and you move on to the next criteria. Once they're done, you know, you guys are the determining factor. That's the responsibility the Parks Board gave you. That's the big difference between what we would do going forward.

We never – staff didn't give recommendations on any of these grants that you've approved so far. You guys did the evaluation. You rated them based on your priorities. We didn't have any input in that. And they don't go back to the Parks Board.

Now, if an applicant feels that they were treated unfairly, they may want to rate this thing. They may want you to take it to the Parks Board; and in that case, yes, we would have to take it to the Parks Board and you'd be able to defend your decision and they'd be able to defend their application. State may be asked to comment on how that – how the interpretation came about; but we've already done that with you at the time that we sat down and rated this. So if we tell you it's a mitigation thing and you say, "We don't think so," then yeah; we disagree on that; but you're the deciding opinion here.

**CHAIR SAVINO:** Okay, the Chair recognizes Hank Rogers.

**MR. ROGERS:** Thank you. You know, I'm very comfortable with this, Mr. Chair, and I think we need to go forward with it and work out the bugs as we move along. I think this is great. Thank you, Doris.

**CHAIR SAVINO:** Okay, before – I can entertain a motion on this to pass it as – you know, with any – Doris?

**MS. PULSIFER:** Before you do that, do you want me to add another category for matching funds?

**CHAIR SAVINO:** Yes because I feel that's important on the thing there.

**MR. ROGERS:** I think we need to be able to add as we go along. This thing is going to be a work in progress. It's not complete by any stretch of the imagination.

**AAG HERNBRODE:** You would add at the end like – we need a set of criteria for this upcoming grant year, this grant manual; and then, you know, we'll try it out. Next time we do a grant cycle and we do a grant manual, that's when we readjust it. It's



never written in stone; but we do have to have a set of criteria for this year so Bob can write the grant manual.

**MR. ROGERS:** So we need a motion from you that would state that.

**CHAIR SAVINO:** No –

**MR. BALDWIN:** Right now, before you even get there you need to decide what kind of point values you want to assign to all these categories. Then you approve that document because that's what we will go forward with in announcing the grant.

**MR. ROGERS:** I think she's already got it on there, doesn't she, Bob?

**MR. BALDWIN:** Well, it's up to you. Is eight right, is four right, is one right?

**CHAIR SAVINO:** The only question I have is back to the thing of the increase on number four, second-level priority; is the increase on the ground management presence in law enforcement? I still feel strongly that with the amount of money the OHV community is giving to Game and Fish, \$1.4 million a year; they get more money than we have for projects. It should be a number one priority.

**MR. BALDWIN:** Mr. Chair, again, in the statute these criteria applied to the money that State Parks gets in our program. It doesn't have anything to do with any of the other money that goes anywhere else. This only applies to money that State Parks administers.

**CHAIR SAVINO:** David.

**MR. MOORE:** I'd like to speak on the thing. That being what Bob said as far as the priority levels that are coming here and it has something to do with what you said.

I think, personally, that there needs to be an adjustment to the levels. To just call it law enforcement or whatever is kind of deceiving. Personally I don't believe that state and federal agencies that have funding from other sources; and part of that is for their ongoing operations should have a high rating for equipment, et cetera, that's going to be used in their day-to-day operations. They shouldn't be coming to us for that, I don't believe. I think that the purpose of this money is to do other kinds of projects; and these agencies that are applying for things to buy Razors, quads, trailers and everything – they should be looking in their own budgets and other places; because I don't feel that this money – that's what the idea was, strictly to add equipment to ongoing, regular state and federal agencies that have different budgets, you know, that come from other places.

The rating thing needs to identify certain projects. It's okay for them to apply for a grant for that; but I think that the rating system needs to be such that it's not automatically given a high score because it has to do with law enforcement or something else. On these equipment purchases I think it needs to have a separate category that's rated differently.

**MR. PFEIFER:** Mr. Chairman, if this is so important can we maybe table it and then have it at the next meeting as a discussion because it's locked to this thing.

**CHAIR SAVINO:** The only problem with that, Pete, is that they're antsy. Bob's antsy. They need to get this manual out for the grants for this upcoming year. We've kept on going with it – I would love to table it and get it to where I can at least have more than three members here to discuss this thing. But, we need to go forward with something.

**MR. ROGERS:** Bob, how'd you feel about Jeff's suggestion down there? With the competitive grants we do this. With our partners that we've been working with for years we keep it the same. That way we have the ability – when Game & Fish comes in like Dave's talking about. He's got heartburn over, you know, giving out all this money to them. They've already got that. Maybe that's the way we alleviate that problem there. Strictly do this with the competitive, nonprofit groups that are coming in. Are you comfortable with that?

**MR. BALDWIN:** Well, I'd have to discuss it with my attorney; but there could be a couple options that I think that – the whole thing about a grant program is, you know, if you're giving out this pot of money which is identified for these purposes to anyone who's eligible to apply for it; and to say that these people can apply for that money this way and these people can apply for it this way –

**MR. MOORE:** The difference in my view is these equipment purchases. That's a lot of what bothers me. Projects are different than supplying equipment to agencies.

**CHAIR SAVINO:** On this thing here – okay, go ahead, Joy.

**AAG HERNBRODE:** The way you might accomplish your goal, then, without messing with the statutory priorities is to say for the points OHVAG is going to assign you give two or three extra points for projects that are grounded – I don't know how we would word that – but projects that are on the ground, not including equipment purchase. Those projects get – just like – you know, you talked about it, but I haven't heard a consensus or a vote on. This is one of the things you could add, projects that bring in a match would get some extra points.

What I think Bob is asking you to do now is come up with a list of the things that are going to get extra points for next year so you can vote on those and the numbers that are here. Because right now Doris has got it all adding up to 100, which is good. If you come up with ten things, you're going to award one extra point on each; then you have to take ten points out of somewhere so you don't end up with 110.

**CHAIR SAVINO:** Okay, here's what I'm going to do to speed this thing up along. Do you have other questions? Hank?

**MR. ROGERS:** The only thing I got – you know I do think – and I understand Bob's concern here; but you know what, we've partnered a long time before Forest Service, Game & Fish, and State Land. They've been good partners for the most part. You know, I think there is – there may be a way. Joy, you can address that. Can we keep it separate, legally?

**AAG HERNBRODE:** Well, I haven't had a lot of time to think about this. One caveat, the big thing is that you have to have – for the people who are not your partner you have to have a sum certain they're going to apply for. So you have to split from the amount of money you have available and say this much is for the people who go through this process; and this much is for those other people. Even if you get to the end of the year and you have money left in this pot and no money left in this pot and you want some around, you can't move it around.

So, there may be some disadvantages for you in doing that that you don't like. But that's the big thing. I need to look at the rest of it and make sure we can make the rest of it work.

**CHAIR SAVINO:** Okay, I'm hearing everything everybody's saying and I agree with everything. Okay? I agree with you, Hank, that we need to have a way to separate that and if we have a different pile –

**MR. ROGERS:** I don't know if I'm saying that, John. I'm just saying we need to think about that. If it's possible –

**CHAIR SAVINO:** Okay, let's go with the way it is without – I'm going to entertain a motion in a second. If we're allowed to do it, have the form like it is. In that form, if Game and Fish applies for a grant as they have in the past, we take that into consideration because if it's not in that category – in that thing – because I may look at it and say, well, they're wanting \$858,000 for equipment over here and, you know, we don't have that much. So I need that chart there – where the money is there to know. Like we did last time. Game and Fish wanted 12 UTVs. Well we only gave them five. And we told them that we wanted to check to see how the monitor – to see how the program's going, to see if they're used for education and stuff like this and not just strictly law enforcement. So, we need that in that.

At this point so we can carry on – Doris?

**MS. PULSIFER:** I'm sorry, just for a clarification. Because category four does not identify an OHVAG priority, do you want me to use that section for points if they have a match for now?

**CHAIR SAVINO:** Okay, that's one of the things I'm going to ask for in my motion. Okay? Because I have to put it in motion form to do it.

**MR. BALDWIN:** First of all, you want to correct this form to where you want it and then just approve the form. That's all you've got to do. If in that section you want the match or you want another table that matches – because you already mentioned there that you want to give priority to projects outside Maricopa County. So you need to figure out what the points are then just approve the whole thing.

**CHAIR SAVINO:** Okay, we are going to take a five-minute recess. In the meantime, can you put that in there? Do you have the ability to put that in there right now?

**MS. PULSIFER:** Yeah, I think so.

**AAG HERNBRODE:** Put what in there?

[End of tape.]

**CHAIR SAVINO:** . . . to a category, okay, on that; and also separate the ground projects from the equipment projects. We have to have a category that separates. We want to separate these projects over here. Those are on-the-ground projects. We want to separate them and have a category for equipment. So –

**AAG HERNBRODE:** And extra points if somebody is going to do on-the-ground work.

**CHAIR SAVINO:** Right. And what I'm asking, Doris, do you have the ability to do that right now?

**MS. PULSIFER:** Yeah, it will take me a little while.

**CHAIR SAVINO:** Five minutes?

**MS. PULSIFER:** I'll work on it.

**MR. BALDWIN:** Mr. Chair, I'd like to remind you that I suggested when we did the agenda that the Ambassador Program people make their presentation because they have another meeting at one o'clock.

**CHAIR SAVINO:** I'm sorry, but we're doing this. We need to get this chart going and you are next on line – in line. During this five minutes – because during this time –

**MR. ROGERS:** What's your intent here?

**CHAIR SAVINO:** My intent is –

**MR. ROGERS:** To get this and then vote on it?

**CHAIR SAVINO:** Yes, we need a vote. I want to give her five minutes to put this on the thing – go ahead, Thomas.

**MR. McARTHUR:** Yes, I have a question here – actually two. Okay, there is a – there will be a motion to approve this. So, if we vote in the affirmative and approve this, what happens?

**CHAIR SAVINO:** It goes and – we approve it and we give the okay to Bob Baldwin to put it in the manual for the grants for this coming year.

**MR. BALDWIN:** For the next cycle.

**CHAIR SAVINO:** For the next cycle.

**MR. BALDWIN:** We'll write a manual with these criteria in it and if you want to change it after that, you can change it for the next cycle.

**MR. ROGERS:** And that's good.

**MR. PFEIFER:** I agree, we'll go with it.

**CHAIR SAVINO:** Okay, you had another question.

**MR. McARTHUR:** Yes I do. And if it does not get approved what happens?

**CHAIR SAVINO:** Then it doesn't go into the next cycle and we leave it like it is.

**MR. McARTHUR:** To me if it's not approved we can still go ahead and use it in our own evaluations, it just not – does not become part of –

**CHAIR SAVINO:** Not really. Not really because – it's only fair to the people out there, the grant applicants, that they know what the playing field is like; what the rules are. If we have this to our own ability then they're going to say – and we come back and they're here at our meeting and we say, "Well we rated this here." And they say, "Well, we didn't know you had to give this information. We have that information, too." So, I can understand why they need – State Parks needs something – a tool to give out to the grant applicant.

**MR. McARTHUR:** Okay, I want to comment. I spent a lot of years in the nonprofit community and there's a big difference between, you know, the small groups that come forward and apply for a grant who are passionate about their project but don't necessarily have a background and the ability to put together the grants really well as opposed to organizations that are well structured like agencies in the government and so forth.

And something is lost in the process when you go from, "Please tell me about this project you are passionate about;" to, "Here fill in the boxes." You automatically skew the process. The process transforms from going with – instead of a project that somebody wants to do, it now becomes a project that they want to do, but they've got to distort it to fill in the boxes. As I said previously I think the metric is very useful for our evaluation processes, but as soon as we put a metric out there and a form that people have to fill out things change. Let me say, things change often for the better – probably most often – but sometimes not; and it will skew things, it will change things.

**CHAIR SAVINO:** Okay.

**MR. PFEIFER:** I just have a comment.

**CHAIR SAVINO:** Okay, go ahead. The Chair recognizes Pete.

**MR. PFEIFER:** Okay, my comment is that it just seems a little bit premature to be putting this out there in the manual to say this is how, you know, OHVAG is gonna look at your projects. Because we haven't had meetings to discuss this a little bit further as a group to get this a little more ironed out. You know, I would love to use it basically as a worksheet for the next year; and then the next year after we've gotten the bugs worked out, stuff like that, then we can put it in the manual and say, "This is how we're going to be grading your projects."

**CHAIR SAVINO:** Okay, here's what I'm going to do so we all have time to think about this. I'm going to move on to another subject – the Ambassador Program now and we're going to table this for later on toward the end of the meeting. What I want you guys in the meantime to be thinking about is how we want to go about this. Because I do – I feel and I'm getting – Joy over here, our attorney, is pounding her head against the table. We can't use it – I believe her in saying

that we can't use it as a tool without letting the grant applicants know that we're using it as a tool.

Now if there's a way around that – and I'd like to have everybody that's involved in this to think about a different angle around that so it gives us a little time; or maybe the answer is to have another meeting in the meantime to get this. And I'd like to have in the meantime – so later on when we talk about it Bob you give us a "drop-dead" date as to when we have to have it. So it gives us more time. So with that said I'd like to move on. First –

**MR. MOORE:** I agree with what you're saying and I also hear what Bob is saying that we need to do – I personally feel – you know, I'm not one for – have hard and fast – I like to be able to make rational judgments inbetween. I think that we should, for the purposes of having something coherent that other people can see and everything, go forward, do the best we can. This is not forever. It's one cycle. We go on to the next cycle. I say that we should put something out, we should publish it, there should be a caveat that says, "These are general guidelines, a final decision is to be made upon group discussions." Because it doesn't do a lot of good to just constantly put everything in there. Nothing in this world is perfect. You make something that's pretty close, put it out there; that this is not the final say, and have that as part of the manual, then it's understood.

**CHAIR SAVINO:** Okay, did you hear any of that, Doris?

**MS. PULSIFER:** I'm sorry, no.

**AAG HERNBRODE:** These grants require – have a requirement published and firm.

**MR. MOORE:** Yeah but we can list those as minimum requirements with the specific details open to discussion can't we?

**AAG HERNBRODE:** No.

**MR. BALDWIN:** They don't allow warm and fuzzy categories. It's cut and dry. Either they meet the requirements or they do not meet the requirements. Your warm and fuzzy category is right here what you're putting in. If you want to set up criteria right now that you're going to judge the next round of grants on based on "is it someplace where we haven't given out money already?" "Do you want to put a cap on equipment purchases?" You can do all that stuff ahead of time.

**CHAIR SAVINO:** Okay.

**AAG HERNBRODE:** You can say, "Gosh, we went through, we rated everybody on this. There were some really good projects that we didn't – that didn't do very well on this. We need to make some tweaks. Please come back," because you guys do run grant cycles, you know, all the time. "Please come back next time, we're trying to fix it."

**MR. MOORE:** Okay, what about – I'm just saying, say we have 100 point system – that makes it real easy – what happens if you have two grants that are, say,

within 10 or 15 percent – whatever that is – of each other. They’re very similar as far as the thing and you’re going to allocate so much money, you know, deciding between the two. In the past, we kind of went down until we had the money and then funded all of them to that point. I was never happy with that situation myself.

All I’m saying is if you have two that are maybe not exactly – you have one that’s 88 points and one that’s 87 points, you shouldn’t automatically select the one and fund the one that’s 88 points because then – and this is a little bit arbitrary and a little bit – there are some projects that can be very important that will get much more use, much more popularity, maybe good press, maybe everything else that scores one or two points less and we need to be able to make a judgment and say, “We want this one first and then that one,” even if it misses by a certain percentage.

**MR. BALDWIN:** Well, in your – you’re going to be restricted only by the money available, so – in the State Parks strategy – strategic plan for grants says that at least 50 percent of the awarded grants must score high priority, which means 80 points or more. So if we have three grants that score 80 points, you can fund up to three grants that score less than 80 point. If there are 10 grants that score 80 points, you can score up to 10 more grants. But then again, once you get beyond that number, it’s down to funds available. So that’s the only restriction on your money. That 87 score – if you like 87 more than 88 but they both get funded, what’s the difference?

**MR. MOORE:** I agree with that. Can we make – if we have bonus points, what about negative points? And my point is, you know, when we had the Desert Wells thing – if you have someone that’s applying and you have “90 percent of all the money in one grant.” I think that it may be in most cases better off to fund several grants rather than one large one.

**AAG HERNBRODE:** That’s why a cap would take care of that problem. You could do a negative point but you get into fairly complicated math at that point; and just – socially people feel bad when they get negative points on something; so, to the extent you can make them a positive point for what you want.

**MR. BALDWIN:** And the cap is still in here. That’s another thing that you can decide right now. You want to cap it at –

**MR. MOORE:** There might be a grant that meets \$1 million. I want a possibility.

**MR. BALDWIN:** That’s why we haven’t had a cap. When the Land Department came in and asked for \$858,000.

**CHAIR SAVINO:** But then go back to the point, then you have to make all the grant applicants aware that there is no cap then. Then you can’t use that as a consideration if you’re doing that. So you have to be out – up front with that.

**AAG HERNBRODE:** And to answer your first question, in most of the world, discretion is a part of something. Discretion is very difficult. That’s why we ask – trying to get you to articulate some categories. I know that you all feel strongly

about things and I think you just haven't ever articulated them, at least to each other, about "these are the kind of things that I want in a grant that we score."

**CHAIR SAVINO:** Gee whiz, I wonder why? We have to have that open meeting law and we can't articulate to each other.

[Laughter.]

**AAG HERNBRODE:** Well we've got an opportunity right now.

**CHAIR SAVINO:** Well then we're time constrained. That's one of our issues which we'll go into at a different time.

Right now what I want to do – did you call Jay? Is he on his way?

**MR. BALDWIN:** He's not available right now, but he –

**MR. ROGERS:** Let's go ahead and do this thing? Let's get it done.

**CHAIR SAVINO:** Okay. Doris. We can't just throw something out there. Because if we vote on a motion –

**MR. BALDWIN:** You're going to need to go through this chart, category-by-category and say, "yes we want eight points for all of these." "Yes we want four points for these; yes we want five points for our optional OHVAG stuff" –

**CHAIR SAVINO:** Okay.

**MR. BALDWIN:** And then say, "This is the way we want it." And then vote on that.

**CHAIR SAVINO:** Bob, what's the "drop-dead" date? Do you have to have something to put out for your manual? I know that we don't have another meeting until February. So I know that's our "drop-dead" date. When do you have to have that grant manual put out to them?

**MR. BALDWIN:** Well, the program has to be announced 45 days before we can accept applications – or to the application deadline date. So, 45 days, then we can accept the applications; then we have to have a meeting after that to review them. I need time to get the applications together and get them out to you. Then you have to meet to review them.

**CHAIR SAVINO:** Okay, here's what I'm going to do. I'd like to entertain a motion that we – on the subject of this chart – "In consideration and approval of the draft OHV Project Evaluation form, that we table this subject and staff – State Parks' staff sends out a 'doodle' on a meeting request to where we have a quorum to discuss this and post it to where we can finalize this." So we're going to have a special meeting for this.

**MR. PFEIFER:** I'll second it.

**CHAIR SAVINO:** I'll entertain it. Somebody has to make that motion.

**MR. MOORE:** I'd like to make the motion to have a special meeting with one subject, to iron out the rating numbers and details of this form so that we can have it available for Parks to put in the manual.



**CHAIR SAVINO:** Okay, David Moore made the motion; is there a second?

**MR. PFEIFER:** I'll second it.

**CHAIR SAVINO:** Okay, Pete Pfeifer seconded it. Any discussion?

[No verbal response.]

**CHAIR SAVINO:** No! Good. All those in favor signify by saying aye?

**CHORUS OF VOICES:** Aye.

**CHAIR SAVINO:** Okay, we have four ayes. It's been approved. No, don't interrupt – don't change the –

**AAG HERNBRODE:** I'm not going to change – I was just going to suggest – Mr. Chairman, I would suggest that maybe your members come to that special meeting with three or five things that they think ought to be awarded extra points for the next cycle. So that everybody has a list – a fairly short list – of things that they think are the important items and then you're ready to go and maybe this could be a very short session.

**CHAIR SAVINO:** Okay I'd like to direct staff – since I can't send it out to the blanket thing – open meeting laws – Bob, would you please send out whatever she said?

[Laughter.]

**AAG HERNBRODE:** And you don't have to send it back in, just bring it with you.

**CHAIR SAVINO:** Okay, that motion carried. Let's go on to the next subject. What we're going to discuss now – we're going to – Bill Gibson, our thing isn't scheduled – I can't go into any of these extensions if you're here for those extensions?

**MR. GIBSON:** No, I'm just here for the OHV interests.

**CHAIR SAVINO:** Oh okay, great! Because if anybody's here for the extensions, I cannot talk about those grant extensions until 1:00 p.m. Because it was listed as a time – on time there. So, 1:00 p.m. is when I can discuss those grants. So I'm not ignoring you, I'm just waiting for that. Okay?

**CHAIR SAVINO:** With that said, my next thing was going to talk – agenda item D, "Presentation on history and status of OHV Ambassador Program." There are two parts to this. The first one is that Assistant Director Jay Ziemann, which he isn't here right now, will present an overview, history and status of the OHV Program. Since he's not here I'd like to go on to the second phase of that.

**AAG HERNBRODE:** Mr. Chairman, you could give him a little more time by approving your consent agenda.

**MR. ROGERS:** Then take a small break.

**CHAIR SAVINO:** Okay. I was trying to take a break earlier. Are you guys okay with that?

**MS. DWYER:** Yes. The other meeting that we need to go to, Bill Gibson is going to be involved with that; and he's going to tell him that we may be coming on a little later.

**CHAIR SAVINO:** Okay. Great! But we'll get you outta here as soon as we can. I'm going to go to the Consent Agenda Items.

**E. CONSENT AGENDA**

- 1. Approval of Minutes from the August 19, 2011, OHVAG meeting.**
- 2. Approval of Minutes from the September 16, 2011, OHVAG meeting. (not provided)**
- 3. Approval of Minutes from the October 17, 2011, OHVAG meeting**

**MR. ROGERS:** I move that we approve the Consent Agenda Items, Mr. Chair.

**CHAIR SAVINO:** No.

**MR. BALDWIN:** Well, you can't, you have to suspend again because you don't have the minutes for September 16.

**MR. ROGERS:** What are you talking about you sent them out to us.

**MR. BALDWIN:** Not for September 16. I sent you the agenda for August 19 or whatever that was, and Doris – the October 17 minutes have been provided.

**CHAIR SAVINO:** Okay, we can't – so you're talking about the ones – we don't have the September 16<sup>th</sup> ones?

**AAG HERNBRODE:** So, the motion was to approve the minutes with the exception of item two.

**MR. ROGERS:** That would be fine. I move that.

**CHAIR SAVINO:** Okay and we'll probably have that – when we do that next meeting. Okay. So, is there a second on that motion?

**MR. MOORE:** I second.

**CHAIR SAVINO:** Seconded by David Moore. Any discussion on the minutes from August 19, 2011 and October 17, 2011?

**[No verbal response.]**

**CHAIR SAVINO:** All those approved?

**CHORUS OF VOICES:** Aye.

**CHAIR SAVINO:** Okay, I have two ayes there, I believe. So there's no unanimous – so we move that. It's approved.

**MR. BALDWIN:** So, Jay's in a meeting with Renee. So I guess we have no idea how soon –

**CHAIR SAVINO:** Let's take a break. Five minute break, please.

**[Break to 11:40 am.]**

#### **D. PRESENTATION ON HISTORY AND STATUS OF OHV AMBASSADOR PROGRAM**

- 1. Assistant Director, Jay Ziemann, will present an overview history and status of the OHV Program.**
- 2. The Statewide OHV Ambassador Program Coordinator, Chris Gammage and Program Administrator, Marge Dwyer will present a thorough review of the operations of the OHVA Program including plans for expansion in 2012 and information on all expenditures since the beginning of the Program.**

**CHAIR SAVINO:** Okay, the next agenda item, number three, "OHVAG will review and approve the two – no, that's not it. I jumped ahead. Item D, excuse me. Agenda Item D "Presentation on history and status of the OHV Ambassador Program." As I stated, there are two parts. The first part if Jay Ziemann, which is "AOL." So we're going to move to the second part, "The Statewide OHV Ambassador Program Coordinator, Chris Gammage, and Program Administrator, Marge Dwyer, will present a thorough review of the operations of the OHV Ambassador Program including plans for expansion in 2012 and information on all expenditures since the beginning of the program."

So, the Chairman recognizes Chris Gammage.

**MR. GAMMAGE:** Bob, did you want to start out by saying anything?

[No verbal response.]

**MR. GAMMAGE:** All right. My name is Chris Gammage, I'm the Statewide OHV Ambassador Program Coordinator.

**MS. DWYER:** I'm Marge Dwyer. I'm the OHVA Statewide Program Administrator.

**MR. GAMMAGE:** I'm going to start off by briefly going over kind of the history of the program, how it's been operating to date; as well as some of the expansion grant stuff and some of the unit benefits. Bob should have sent you guys out –

**CHAIR SAVINO:** Which one are you referring to?

**MR. GAMMAGE:** This is going to be the one referred to as the OHV Ambassador Program Overview.

**CHAIR SAVINO:** Go ahead.

**MR. GAMMAGE:** Okay. So, basically, the history of the program in 2002 to 2007 at the request of resource agencies and user groups, a volunteer program was developed to meet these following goals. As a recognizable presence on OHV routes, model appropriate OHV safety and behavior to create a positive image of OHV recreation; and to promote responsible motorized recreation use and land stewardship. Goal number two was to support cooperation between the OHV users and the OHV management agencies. Goal number three was to provide OHV information about where to ride, riding safety, etiquette rules and

regulations. The fourth goal was to assist resource management agencies in monitoring, maintaining, mitigating and improving OHV routes and facilities.

Also, in this same time period, policies, procedures and training documents were developed by the planning team staff for the safety and efficient operation of the program under the direction of the Arizona State Parks staff. In 2007 to 2008 was when the program officially started its on-the-ground work. The first training was in 2007. The first training was in 2007 and that was for the Cave Creek Ranger District for the Tonto National Forest; the Hassayampa Field Office with the Bureau of Land Management; and the Tucson Field Office in the Middle Gila Canyon / Florence Junction area. These were the three pilot areas for this time period which moved from 2007 to about 2010, when the program was in its pilot stage.

In 2010 the program was officially out of the pilot phase and because of its documented achievements and the success of the program, it was decided by the planning team as well as State Parks and OHVAG to expand the program to make it more of a statewide effort. Also during this time period with the loss of State Park staff, myself and Marge kind of took on more of the planning, development and policies, as well as the stuff we originally were hired to do, which was on-the-ground work. So we kind of took over the full brunt of the program during this same time period.

**MS. DWYER:** It might be worthwhile just mentioning that we have similar responsibilities; but in some ways we have different kinds of responsibilities. Why don't you cover what you do?

**MR. GAMMAGE:** Yeah, I let Marge do all the policies and procedures.

**MS. DWYER:** Training –

**MR. GAMMAGE:** Document writing, all that fun stuff.

**MS. DWYER:** Training, recruiting, evaluation, as well as field work.

**MR. GAMMAGE:** Yeah.

**MS. DWYER:** And Chris you do –

**MR. GAMMAGE:** I do that as well. I focus more on the field work. I go to all the events. I supply the equipment, the trailer when requested, that type of stuff.

From 2010 to present, obviously because of trials and errors, the program has developed. We had to rewrite a bunch of the documents. They were updated based on the lessons learned to kind of bring the expansion kind of more streamline. That's been going on. It's still currently going on.

In 2010, BLM, Forest Service, Arizona Game and Fish and State Parks signed a Memorandum of Understanding identifying the mission and goals of the OHV Ambassador Program and pledged cooperation in achieving the goals of the program. So we do have a MOU in place between the cooperating agencies currently. And that's with the Region III Forest Service Office, so it's statewide.

From 2010 to 2011 the program expansion grants were awarded to the Community Forest Trust and the Coconino Rural Environment Corps to include the following areas. So currently we still have the three pilot areas we've been working in for the past couple years. We now operate in three ranger districts on the Prescott National Forest which includes the entire forest through a partnership with the Community Forest Trust. They are the unit coordinator for that area.

Three ranger districts on the Coconino National Forest, which includes the entire forest, with a partnership through the Coconino Rural Environment Corps, so they are the unit coordinator for that area; as well as two ranger districts on the South Kaibab National Forest, also with the Coconino Rural Environment Corps.

In 2012 – currently we have quite a bit of interest to expand the program to other parts of the state. We've met with the Arizona Sun Riders ATV Club, which is out of Quartzite. They would partnership with the BLM Yuma Field Office.

**MS. DWYER:** And as of the 12<sup>th</sup> of this month they will be having a meeting to further decide and discuss. It will be a meeting between the Yuma Field Office – John McDonald who's the new field office manager there and the Sun Riders in Quartzite – as to whether or not they should pursue an expansion grant.

As far as the town of Wickenburg is concerned, we met with them yesterday, as to the potential of them applying for an expansion grant. That sounds to be like it may be a three-way Chamber of Commerce, the City of Wickenburg, and Hassayampa Field Office – they just were briefed on it yesterday; so they haven't quite decided that. As you know, the application grant manual has not been approved; so, all we gave them was –

**CHAIR SAVINO:** What – if I may interrupt. I might as well start now. Whose decision was it to expand this program – this 2012 program – to these specific agencies, that you said, or towns, what have you?

**MS. DWYER:** Well, we haven't decided to do that. I'm just saying they're interested.

**CHAIR SAVINO:** Well, you just mentioned you went out – you mentioned the town of Wickenburg. That you talked to the town of Wickenburg and you talked to the Arizona Sun Riders. The Sun Riders was approved – was one of the three that were originally in that \$75,000. It was the White Mountain Open Trails, it was the Community Forest Trust and the Sun Riders. The Sun Riders, they have their application in.

**MS. DWYER:** They didn't receive a grant, though.

**CHAIR SAVINO:** No, they didn't receive the grant, no. It was just two and then one dropped out. So there was only that \$25,000 to sit in there. Okay?

Where am I missing – it went from those three OHV organizations – no, those two OHV organizations; and is expanding. You're reaching out to the town of

Wickenburg and all these others. Where did that – who made that decision to do that? You two?

**MS. DWYER:** No! There is an expansion grant that is coming out which Bob will talk with you about.

**CHAIR SAVINO:** Right, but the expansion grant's coming out. That's what's in front of us. That's one of the things you're going to just talk about today.

**MS. DWYER:** Right.

**CHAIR SAVINO:** But aren't you putting the cart in front of the horse by going out to the town of Wickenburg and the rest of them to seek them doing this when we haven't even approved that?

**MS. DWYER:** Well we are trying to get information out so people will go out – as I would think – to – it will be on the website. Is that correct, Bob?

**MR. BALDWIN:** I think it will.

**MS. DWYER:** So, it will be out on the website and it will be open to anyone who wishes to apply.

**MR. BALDWIN:** No.

**CHAIR SAVINO:** But that's where it's – it's not open to anybody who wants to apply. We had certain specific guidelines in there. It was back – and if you go back to 2006 – those guidelines – it was an OHV organization. The whole concept of the thing. You can't just say that it's open to anybody that will apply.

**MS. DWYER:** Who meets the guidelines of the expansion grant. We've had interest on the part of those groups that we're giving you – that we're listing here. They have contacted us or they have contacted the resource agency that they wish to partner with; and they want to know something about the grant.

**CHAIR SAVINO:** Okay.

**MS. DWYER:** They will not receive the grant until you have reviewed it.

**CHAIR SAVINO:** Okay. I'm sorry to interrupt you. Go ahead. Are you still –

**MR. GAMMAGE:** I think somebody had a question.

**CHAIR SAVINO:** Okay go ahead. Is there a question?

**MR. PFEIFER:** Yeah, this is Pete. I had a question. My question is, what does Chris see OHVAG's role as being?

**MS. DWYER:** I can answer that. I've been thinking about it a lot. We would love to have you help us recruit for this expansion grant. Tell us who might be interested. Spread the word about the expansion grant. Also help us recruit more Ambassadors that would help us with the program throughout the state. We'd love to have you do that. We'd be very happy to come to your communities, present the program, provide you with an application for the

Ambassador Program, give you presentations on the expansion grant after you have looked at it and reviewed it; any of those kinds of things.

So if there's interest, I can imagine if you let Bob Baldwin know when and where, we'd be happy to do that with you.

**CHAIR SAVINO:** Okay.

**MR. PFEIFER:** A real pointed question. You know, OHVAG has been just sort of on the fringes it seems like of the growth of the Ambassador Program. I'm just curious what you guys think about that?

**MS. DWYER:** As I said, we would love to have you participate in the program as either – if you belong to an organization that meets the requirements of the expansion grant and you feel that there's an opportunity to have that expansion grant, then have us come in and give a presentation. Or if you belong to a group or have a group of riders who might be interested in being Ambassadors, help us recruit those persons for Ambassador work; so you can actually personally participate in the program.

**MR. PFEIFER:** Okay, thanks.

**CHAIR SAVINO:** I have a question. The original – when the concept of the Ambassador Program was presented to OHVAG was that – by State Parks. It was on August 18, 2006. In that concept it says – it says – the idea is to involve – what was stated to us – the idea was to involve OHV groups and others in people projects. Where along the way – I'm losing something because how does it go to from there – OHV groups to the town of Wickenburg, Yuma, Quartzite, all these different areas that the Community Forest Trust, Coconino Rural Environmental Group Corps – how did it go from an OHV organized group “meet-and-greets” to getting all these others involved? Even your Mission Statement now has changed from the original concept of it. You're involving agencies.

The purpose of it wasn't to get the agencies. The agencies were – it was OHV-organized groups helping as – to help its own – what am I looking for here? An OHV-organized group, as a peer group out there in the field, as meet-and-greets; and now it's developed –

**MR. ROGERS:** Well I think it's “users” which is probably a better word. It's user groups. Why are we not targeting user groups? Why are we targeting towns and things like that?

**MS. DWYER:** If I may answer that – and I would ask Joy to step it because it goes back to the 2009 legislature where we received out funds; and what those funds allow.

**CHAIR SAVINO:** Yes, I'd like to hear that.

**MS. DWYER:** Well, if I could just follow on.

**CHAIR SAVINO:** Okay.

**MS. DWYER:** The way that we understand OHV users to be is part of what's in the guide. It defines an OHV as a vehicle – "A motorized vehicle operated primarily off highways on land, water, snow, ice or natural terrain; or on a combination of land, water, snow, ice or other natural terrain; including a two-wheel, three-wheel, four-wheel vehicle, motorcycle, four-wheel drive vehicle, dune buggy, amphibious vehicle, and so forth." So anyone who uses that vehicle is an OHV rider, whether they use it correctly –

**MR. PFEIFER:** We know that.

**MS. DWYER:** Pardon?

**MR. PFEIFER:** We know that.

**MS. DWYER:** Okay, that's the group that we appeal to. Whether –

**CHAIR SAVINO:** The town of Wickenburg is that?

**MS. DWYER:** The town of Wickenburg has a trail head that they are installing for OHV users; and they're working with the Hassayampa Field Office.

**CHAIR SAVINO:** What does that have to do with an OHV organization user group?

**MS. DWYER:** I'm saying that a user group is not how we define who we work with, primarily. We work with anyone who has an OHV vehicle and uses it. That's –

**MR. PFEIFER:** Therein lies what is concerning us. Originally there was seed money. It was \$25,000 grants that were supposed to basically be offered up to OHV clubs – user groups to spread the word about the Ambassador Program; and then the next thing it jumped into was the Community Forest Trust and other organizations like that. So we're just trying to understand this middle tier that's being built and what their role is.

**MS. DWYER:** Here's how we look at it. In order for OHV to have a place in recreation it needs to be supported by the broader public and understood by the broader public. So the broader you can get the groups that are involved with supporting OHV ridership like Community Forest Trust, or like Coconino Rural Environmental Corps, the stronger and more positive the feeling will be toward OHV riding.

**CHAIR SAVINO:** And Marge, in your mind – and I believe you really feel that way, okay? That's different than what the OHV community feels. Okay? This program was set up as an OHV program, funded by all OHV dollars for peer groups to go out there and do it. This has expanded into – which I'm going to get into in a little bit – a law enforcement segment of it and the whole nine yards. This wasn't set up there. We had no intention when this originally was set up to have it to where the outside community polices what we do. We wanted to have the ability –

**MR. GAMMAGE:** It's not the outside community policing. The grant money is going to an organization to provide a unit coordinator. So they're providing the



volunteer coordinator. They're not providing any people within the organization to go out and police us. They're still recruiting from the OHV community to be the Ambassadors.

So, yeah, we offered it up to clubs. Unfortunately there were no clubs that wanted to take on the responsibility to provide that unit coordinator, to track all the funds, to report back –

**CHAIR SAVINO:** No, that's wrong. Our club was willing to do that. We backed out of it because of BLM 's involvement in there and started putting in the flavor of things – and went against what we were saying. The original thing was when we came down on the trailers, for instance – we were going to get a trailer and have it under our name, okay; and have it with the flavor of – the backing of – background of the forest. Okay? We wanted to have that. The next thing we know, after we were awarded we get an email from Marge stating that, "No, we decided we're going to buy the trailers."

**MS. DWYER:** I didn't send you that email.

**CHAIR SAVINO:** Okay, then, Bob. It was sent – I have it here – that you were in contact with our people up there. So anyway I'm getting off the thing. What I want to get back to is the original – here on this paper, "The OHV Ambassador Program," the big picture. Okay? This was sent out by Bob Baldwin. "The OHV Program was created to benefit agencies responsible for managing OHV recreation." Here is the original concept that Amy gave to us on the Ambassador. You tell me in there where it says, "benefits agencies responsible for managing projects."

It was set up as a thing where a pilot program for one year – which it states right here – the program was going to be a pilot program for one year then come back to us. As Chris just mentioned it was 2000 – that was in 2006. Four years later you finally take it out of the pilot program and nothing was mentioned to us. We've taken this program – I have to make this statement to people, okay? And put on record – I don't think there's a single person in this room who doesn't feel that the Ambassador Program, the original concept of the Ambassador Program was a good concept. It *was* needed. It *is* needed out there. What the issues are that we have is how it got – we're questioning how it came from the original concept to where it is now; and where you're going out to – benefitting agencies responsible for managing, it's not.

This was to help – in a way it does benefit the agencies. It does! But it was – for OHV organized groups to go out there to help police, to educate a meet-and-greet – to help educate the riders that are out there that we saw were uneducated on trail riding and what have you – that's what it was for.

**MS. DWYER:** And it says that.

**CHAIR SAVINO:** It's a long way – that's one little aspect of it now. It's gone way over here now.

**MS. DWYER:** If you look at the numbers that we have given you in the past and you have with you, we do a lot of education, a lot of meet-and-greets. Do you have those numbers?

**CHAIR SAVINO:** Okay, I wanna – before you – Pete, do you have something?

**MR. PFEIFER:** My question is, now that the Community Forest Trust and the other organization is now in the middle of this; does an OHV club now have to go through them to get approval for on-the-ground projects?

**MS. DWYER:** No! No!

**MR. PFEIFER:** Okay, what is the role of those organizations?

**MS. DWYER:** They provide a unit coordinator who coordinates the volunteers – the Ambassador volunteers – to do meet-and-greets, to do patrolling, to assess the routes to find out whether they need to be repaired, replaced – where the numbers of concentration are, to provide that information back.

**MR. PFEIFER:** They do the legwork and other logistics –

**MS. DWYER:** Exactly! And to do any special –

**MR. PFEIFER:** Are they receiving any money for that?

**MS. DWYER:** I'm sorry?

**MR. PFEIFER:** Are they receiving any money for that?

**MS. DWYER:** Are the Ambassadors receiving money?

**MR. PFEIFER:** No, is the Community Forest Trust receiving money from the Ambassador Program?

**MR. GAMMAGE:** The Community Forest Trust got the grant for the equipment. Their unit coordinator is funded, not through the OHVAG, not through any of the OHV money; they got a separate grant through POLARIS to fund their unit coordinator.

**CHAIR SAVINO:** Okay, now; how much money has the Ambassador Program funded through OHVAG, through State Parks, given to Community Forest Trust?

**MR. GAMMAGE:** Community Forest Trust got the \$15,000 grant plus the trailer package. That's it.

**CHAIR SAVINO:** Originally it was a \$25,000 grant?

**MR. GAMMAGE:** No, it was \$15,000 cash plus equipment, which came out to about \$25,000, I believe.

**CHAIR SAVINO:** That's all they've gotten?

**MS. DWYER:** That's all they've gotten.

**MR. GAMMAGE:** That's all they've gotten.

**CHAIR SAVINO:** They've not received a dime since then?

**MR. GAMMAGE:** No. They got a grant from Yamaha to provide an ATV; and they got a grant from POLARIS to provide funding for their unit coordinator.

**MS. DWYER:** Exactly!

**CHAIR SAVINO:** Okay. I'm going to get into that issue about that coordinator's position in a second. Pete, did you have anything else?

**MR. PFEIFER:** Yeah. How much did the Coconino Rural Environment Corps get?

**MR. GAMMAGE:** They also got the equipment package plus a work order from State Parks. Bob is not here and I do not know the amount.

**CHAIR SAVINO:** It was \$163,400 or \$800, I believe. That was because it was under that – two things that we voted down unanimously at our meeting. It was \$330,400 at our May 2011 meeting. We voted that down. We recommended. The reason why we voted it down wasn't because we don't – didn't think the project was good; we wanted to have time. We were sprung on that two days before the meeting. We voted that we wanted to keep it at the current levels of \$110,000 as the program was; and the three \$25,000 grants – keep it at that level until our next meeting until we could dig into it a little bit further. Okay? That's why we voted that down. I want to get that clear.

Then it went – staff took it to the Board and the Board approved the \$330,000. That \$330,000 -- \$166,400 around there, roughly – was for your administration of BLM; and the \$163,000 – X amount of dollars – was for Coconino Rural to expand the program – to go and give it to Coconino. They since went out and hired Robert Kline to manage the program. They have a manager out there. That's how that money came about.

**MR. ROGER:** John, I want to clarify one thing. We didn't vote it down, we voted to shelve it.

**CHAIR SAVINO:** Yes we – all we did was pushed it up to the next –

**MR. ROGER:** That was a simpler way to put it.

**CHAIR SAVINO:** Right, it wasn't voted down. It was just shelved. But they decided to run and go forward with it, you know, on their own. That clarifies that.

Pete, did you have anything else on that?

**MR. PFEIFER:** Well, just another comment; and that was when I read through the minutes on how the Ambassador Program was developed, a concern that they had was giving enough money to the Ambassador Program without really a clear accounting of how it's going to be obligated; and that's once again become an issue because we've asked for an accounting of the money and the stuff that we've gotten is incomplete or hasn't arrived in a timely manner – I'll put it to you that way. So that's another issue.

If the Ambassador Program is truly part of Arizona State Parks, OHVAG has a role in basically making sure that when taking large sums of money out of the Sticker Program to fund a project that we have some sort of say-so or oversight, at least so we can account for those dollars in case our constituents ask about it.

**CHAIR SAVINO:** Do you have any reply to that?

**MS. DWYER:** I think at the last Council meeting you gave out – we agree with you; and I don't personally have charge of any budget funds. I believe that's something that Bob has and that's a question you should give to him.

**CHAIR SAVINO:** You understand – I hope you understand where we're coming from.

**MS. DWYER:** Oh yes. Absolutely!

**CHAIR SAVINO:** I have to repeat. The program is good. The concept of the program is a good program; but when you're sitting there and I've asked for it for two years now, an itemized breakdown of the funds and I finally get it at the Governing Council meeting, this is the first time officially that our group has received this breakdown of money. It just leads to questions. A lot of the stuff I'm going to be asking you it was before your time.

**MS. DWYER:** That's right.

**MR. GAMMAGE:** And that's probably the reason why it did take us so long to put it together, because the guy who was originally managing the funds had left; so we were trying to find all the paperwork.

**CHAIR SAVINO:** We're just trying to get it back into the proper perspective.

**MS. DWYER:** Could I make a comment? As I may – and you made a good point and I wanted to help resolve some of that.

You mentioned some notes that were taken at a meeting with Amy Racki. I'm sure it was quite a while back when we were talking it. There was a continuous meeting of people – user groups as well. Jeff Gursh was one of them – on how we developed this program. I was there. I was at that time a BLM employee in charge of outdoor recreation planning. Bill Gibson was there, Tami Pike, Sandi McCullen; and one of the things we realized is that because OHV recreation takes place on government land – whether it be state or whether it be federal – we had to take a look at how they needed to manage that land in order to work with them in order for us to be able to support OHV recreation.

So, I think that's why this wording that you're looking at has changed a bit. Because if we can't work with them on their land, according to some of their plans and their timetables, we can't work at all; we cannot individually – as individual people or as small groups just go out on federal land, put up signs, put in staging areas and do things like that. We have to work according to –

**CHAIR SAVINO:** And Marge, all was great. Everything was going good until the inputs of the Coconino Rural Environment Corps, okay, and the Community

Forest Trust had their involvement. Now I've done a lot of – I have to say that I've done a lot of research and talked to different user groups. The person that CREC hired, Robert Kline is a pro OHV user. There is no if, ands or buts about that. I have that – I feel strongly about that.

What happens when he leaves? Which – he's going to leave, you know – you're going to die one of these days.

**MR. GIBSON:** Not for a long time.

**CHAIR SAVINO:** Not for a long time. When he leaves what assurances do we have that the next person isn't a member of the Sierra Club, that has that flavor involved? We want to stay involved in this thing. So the program has been working great other than some of the expenses that were before your time. I've seen and I look at this expense account and I see how it's all of a sudden curtailed back. But before – and I can't cry over spilled milk on what happened before. But I can go forward with it and have some control over it.

CREC has gone out and gotten a guy who can oversee the program. That doesn't – still doesn't take away from the fact that he's paying me now – that we have concerns about that.

**MR. BALDWIN:** Mr. Chairman?

**CHAIR SAVINO:** Yes.

**MR. BALDWIN:** We've given you all the contracts involved in that position at CREC. It's a one-year position. It's funded for one year. When Robert Kline is no longer able to do it, it's up to you to decide if you want to continue.

**CHAIR SAVINO:** But – okay, yes. I understand that. Let me bring up the thing then? Except if CREC decides to go out and hire somebody on their own like Community Forest Trust did. Why didn't – it's like – I questioned that when that came out. Community Forest Trust put out an advertisement to hire a person for the Ambassador Program. They're using – the reply got back, "Well they're not using our money." That doesn't – that's neither here nor there.

Their hiring of thing – it's like if we go out and hire somebody out on our own to do something for OHVAG. You can't do that. That still comes through – and I questioned that – that at least – one of the fallbacks that we have as OHVAG is that we have one of our members on the governing council. The governing council of the Ambassador Program wasn't even aware of that – that they went out and hired – so you're letting an outside group hire somebody in without even having an input on it. You can't do that. I don't care where the money comes from.

What does it look like to the OHV community if they find out that money for that is actually coming from the Sierra Club. And they're saying, "wait a minute, you're having this – Sierra Club is paying for that." Yes, Bob.

**MR. BALDWIN:** Mr. Chair, the Ambassador Program operates with the cooperation between users and the agency. Our agreements are with a group to provide a

volunteer coordinator. That's all we're looking for. We're looking for a person who will operate the Ambassador Program in cooperation with this agency. All right? That person doesn't necessarily have to be an OHV rider, but they have to have volunteer organizational skills and under the agreement with that volunteer, and under the agreement with the volunteer program, and under the agreement with the agency, their duties are very specific. They do exactly what the manual allows them to do to operate and do OHV Ambassador events under the auspices of the agency partner.

So we're not looking for OHA groups to come in and be an Ambassador group. We want a volunteer coordinator. We will recruit volunteers who have to be OHV users, they have to have a vehicle. They can't just come in and not have any riding experience; and that's the program. It's the volunteer coordinator, the recruited OHV users; and the training that's provided by the Ambassador Program in cooperation with whatever the agency wants those people to do.

**CHAIR SAVINO:** Bob, that's your take on it. That's the program in the eyes of State Parks, BLM and the others. That's not necessarily the program in the eyes of the OHV community. They want – if they're paying this money, they want to have OHV groups out there.

**MR. BALDWIN:** So, where are they? They've never come forward. Jim (Harken, Game & Fish), you were one of the original people and Bill Gibson. When this whole thing started, there were patrols with the OHV groups; possibly supported by coalition to do these things; but even when the first training went on, there was no club involvement. There were individuals who were recruited as Ambassadors who performed peer patrols.

**SPEAKER:** And that's the way – it continues to do that.

**MR. BALDWIN:** And that's exactly what we're doing right now.

**CHAIR SAVINO:** Okay. Jeff Gursh.

**MR. GURSH:** The original idea was that individuals who rode or recreated on that forest or that district that knew those trails would actually become Ambassadors for – let's say, the town – Cave Creek District. If you knew the trails, you were a bigger help than someone who didn't; and now that forest ranger doesn't have to train you to go out and find trails – which in some cases the forest ranger doesn't know where the trails are. The point was supposed to be that *us* riders, in the areas that we knew, would go out in the remote areas into the places that we rode where the agency couldn't get to; and they would talk to folks and hand out maps and educate people.

It didn't have to be a club, per se; but you had to have OHVers that had the machines to get out there to do it.

**CHAIR SAVINO:** That's where the whole thing is, with the OHVers. Now those OHVers should be supervised by OHVers.

**MR. GURSH:** Which in the real world would be ideal; but we don't have the clubs or a person who is willing to take that time to be the coordinator. Because most of the time as a coordinator you don't get out in the field. You're just a paper-pusher trying to make sure everything follows the plans.

If we had OHVers who wanted to be Ambassadors, maybe tying – say you have to have a minimum of five, trained OHV persons to be eligible for an Ambassador Program. You've gotta show you've got a minimum of five people from a club – not from a club, but who rode in those areas, that we true OHVers; it wouldn't matter who the supervisor/overlooker was, because in the end it's going to be the Forest Service that says what I want you to do, not the person who's running the OHV Ambassador Program. The agency has to tell you what they'd like to see you do; and then the Ambassadors are going to go out and do that.

So the biggest thing, I think, is that you have to have the trained Ambassadors before you get the money to be an Ambassador Program.

**MS. DWYER:** And that's what it is.

**MR. GURSH:** That would be what I would tie it to.

**CHAIR SAVINO:** But I still have a problem, Jeff, and the rest of the folks in the room. I'll give you an example: When we had Community Forest Trust in front of us and asking – they had their representative here giving a presentation. We asked – I asked them, "Do you have an ATV? Do you ride?" He said, "Oh yeah, I had one in Wyoming on my ranch." Well, that to me isn't an avid OHV recreational person.

**MS. DWYER:** If I may interject. He brought his ATV and that's one of the reasons why Community Forest Trust has put out the application for a specific person through the POLARIS Grants. And if you have read the position description –

**CHAIR SAVINO:** I have.

**MS. DWYER:** Okay, you have to be an OHV rider.

**CHAIR SAVINO:** Okay, and I go back to the thing that I haven't got an answer on yet. Who gave them the approval to get that position?

**MR. BALDWIN:** They didn't need any approval.

**CHAIR SAVINO:** They didn't?

**MR. BALDWIN:** When they got the grant they agreed to provide a coordinator. And the original coordinator was Bruce Mauer who was in front of you from Montana who brought his OHV down. He also has other responsibilities for that group – Community Forest Trust. He coordinates all types of volunteer programs on the forest. So he was taking on the Ambassador Program as an additional duty – and it was too much – and they got grant money from POLARIS and had their own other funds – several other funding sources – to find another person to help coordinate, volunteer events. That's all we ask them to do, provide someone to

communicate – to coordinate volunteer events. The volunteer events are OHV Ambassador events conducted under the auspices of the grant manual in conjunction with the agency lead, trained by the Ambassador Program.

**CHAIR SAVINO:** Okay, what happens when this grant from POLARIS – it's a one-time grant. What happens next year? Do they come to us and ask us for money for that?

**MR. BALDWIN:** They have a three-year grant. You awarded these grants.

**CHAIR SAVINO:** Yes, we awarded one. We didn't award – I want to get it straight.

**MR. BALDWIN:** You had the criteria for the thing. I've given you copies of all of the agreements between those agencies and us and the Forest Service; so it spells out they will provide coordination for the program for three years. The money we're giving them helps cover operating costs. It does not cover any employee costs or salaries. So they're obligated to provide someone to do that coordination for three years. If this guy leaves –

**CHAIR SAVINO:** Bob, okay – then you're right as far as Community Forest Trust goes; but Coconino Rural Environment Corps used part of that \$163,000 to hire Mr. Robert Kline.

**MR. BALDWIN:** And I provided you with their agreement, also. If you read that agreement –

**CHAIR SAVINO:** I did.

**MR. BALDWIN:** Mr. Kline – one of his primary duties was to find people to replace him. To find somebody in the user community who would take over as a coordinator for the Kaibab Forest, for the Coconino Forest, for the Red Rock Ranger District – that is in his agreement in the one-year period. Now, whether or not that happens, it will be interesting.

But the whole concept of this program is that eventually it will be run by the user community. We'd like to have that. They should be the ones who are providing all the coordination. Right now we're developing the program, we're developing the infrastructure, we're expanding so everybody knows what's going on, we have the manuals, we have the trainings – the only reason the program is accepted by the land managers is because it has structure; and until we can move that position – for Chris and Marge – into somebody who's in a user group that wants to take on that job; they're the ones who will be paying him unless you guys decide otherwise.

**CHAIR SAVINO:** Okay. I'm going to recognize Hank first.

**MR. ROGERS:** You know, I'm sitting here listening to this discussion and I think, you know, looking back – probably we rushed a little too quick with this. If the user groups aren't there supporting it, you know, to bring it in and do; I don't think we should do it. I think we should wait until they are and maybe develop from that; rather than bringing in people – you know, I'm not – I'm a person who comes from an area where we just lost 538,000 acres of our forest because of



radical, environmental issues. When I hear “trust” and I hear, you know, “environmental” – I’ve got antennas flying everywhere and a lot of distrust because we’ve lost a beautiful forest up there because of extreme environmental people.

So, I got heartburn when those words come up. Maybe they’re not but I tell you, I’m going to be paying extra attention, though. It looks to me like we rushed into something we shouldn’t have.

**MS. DWYER:** Can I address that, please?

**MR. ROGERS:** Sure.

**MS. DWYER:** As I pointed out before –

**CHAIR SAVINO:** Yes, you may address that?

**MS. DWYER:** Thank you. I should have asked you, I’m sorry.

As I pointed out before, one of the things that the program is doing is developing trusts for OHV ridership throughout the community and in a broader sense. So if you don’t allow that program to be in place you will not have that base of community support developed; and that’s what we’re doing.

So, for example, a Community Forest Trust or a CREC is now supporting the OHV ridership – and that’s what you want. You want to continue to build that trust and understanding of the OHV community. If you break that cycle, then you’re stepping back. Because then you aren’t also going to be able to give the agencies the support they need in order to monitor and to manage those OHV routes where you recreate.

**CHAIR SAVINO:** Jeff.

[End of tape.]

**MR. GURSH:** . . . we’re pretty good about figuring out what works and what doesn’t; but we also – the Johns and Jeffs and Hanks -- we actually have to go back to our clubs and talk to them. One of the worse things, I swear, ever happened was the internet where a rumor or one statement could come along and an entire state would see it as bad, especially the off-highway vehicle community.

So, I agree that we need the cities and the non-motorized user groups to [inaudible] as supporting it. No matter how good the city of Wickenburg is or the Community Forest Trust, if it’s got a name that an OHVer is going to say, “He shouldn’t be watching my trails.” Or, “He shouldn’t be running my program.” No matter how good we do it in the Ambassador Program, it’s going to be a problem. We can’t recruit the people we need. So we – if we could have some way of saying that the people who are on the ground actually doing the “meet-and-greets” are OHVers and trained, that’s going to go a long ways towards – it doesn’t matter who runs it, you have to look at that – who’s running it – from the user perspective, as Hank says.

**SPEAKER:** If it's an environmental group, it doesn't matter how good – same what happened to us. We were running the program to monitor the wilderness – the Arizona Off-Highway Vehicle Coalition – the Sierra Club was having a fit because an OHV group was trying to – the fox guarding the hen house type thing; so it's the perspective.

**CHAIR SAVINO:** Okay, Hank?

**MR. ROGERS:** Just one comment.

**CHAIR SAVINO:** You're next, Pete.

**MR. ROGERS:** The other thing – and Jeff makes a great point, but I want to really emphasize the point. It's our people who are providing the money to allow this to happen; and Jeff and I were on that committee – and several others in here – that formed this law. Our backsides are on the line here. If we misuse this money, then we hear it. We hear it from our groups and there are people out there who did not want this to happen. They're saying, "You watch and see, it's going to go right down the same road as California." And for those of you who don't know what happened in California, they did the same thing. The established this fee to be able to ride in the State of California. Then a liberal governor was appointed or elected in California and they appointed all these guys to oversee these funds; and what did they do? They took all the money, did mitigation work on the areas that were torn up and then shut them down.

That's the reason we're paranoid and we're concerned about where our money is these days. Because there are those out there – there are those out there who would like to do the very same thing they did in California to us if they get the chance. So fortunately we got to see what happened in California and we're watching very closely.

**CHAIR SAVINO:** Pete.

**MR. PFEIFER:** Yeah, the comment was made about there was sort of a leap, you know, that maybe we moved too fast. I can remember when it was seed money for the OHV clubs; and then the next thing you kind of jumped into, you know, the CREC I guess it is and some of those organizations are now on board being organizers for the Ambassador program. What we need is a description of that coordinator position and the page deal; and the organizations like the NOHVCC, the National Off-Highway Vehicle Conservation Council and some other organizations – the AMA and even in Arizona the AMRA. There may be some folks from the OHV community, retired people maybe who would take on the responsibility of those coordinator positions. So there was just a leap made, maybe a little too quick.

**MS. DWYER:** I believe – if I might address that?

**CHAIR SAVINO:** Yes, go ahead.

**MS. DWYER:** I believe in your documents you probably have an abbreviated version of what that unit coordinator needs to do; and I'm looking for that at this moment.

**CHAIR SAVINO:** It's in there.

**MS. DWYER:** If you take a look – I'm trying to find the page it's on. Do you see it?

**CHAIR SAVINO:** David, while they're looking?

**MR. MOORE:** I was just responding – they made the comment that we have not gotten the quantity of actual Ambassadors and that participation that they would like to have and they would like to see; and yet the rate of increase in the program doesn't seem to coordinate at all with the rate of the people who are involved in it. That alarms me.

I think the amount of dollars spent and everything should go up with the amount of people involved, otherwise you have a thing that's top heavy and in looking to do something if we need to review how the money is spent and put it so that we have – first, get the volunteers; then get the coordinators; then get the money instead of the other way around. The only part of the program that's really expanded from what I see is the amount spent on it.

**CHAIR SAVINO:** You have a more delicate way of putting than I do. I look at it and I see this program and where it's gone from this original concept and it's just big government. It's just a way in – I understand that you guys are dedicated to this program. You really are, okay? If I were in that position I would just look for more ways to expand it. I would because it's a great program. We're saying, "Wait a minute. There's a problem here." If we're having problems getting OHV people – groups out there to do it, then maybe we have to reign it back in like Hank said, and re-evaluate what we're doing.

We're not saying taking the program and doing away with it; we're just saying re-evaluate it. When I look at the expenses of having – the hours that have been spent. Now, again, I can't go over what's happened in the past; but – what's happened in the past, we've just allowed the funding to go. The other day at our meeting I had with Renee – Hank and I had with Renee – Jay's take on it was – he said, "Well, you guys award the money at the beginning of the year and then maybe" – "they're not going to tell you each individual thing, you just award the money." Well, yes and no. I know back in May of 2010 we awarded a grant for \$110,000 to BLM for administration of the project; plus the \$75,000. We can't take that back. That was a given. But it's expanded to where we want to reign it back in and take a look at this. Where are we going with all this? Okay?

I have a problem myself on – let me ask you this first: What's the result of the audit? That BLM – you told me at the – told all of us at that meeting – the governing council meeting – that we have some issues. I asked you point blank about some of this equipment. You had mentioned that there's an audit – you were conducting an audit. The results – what are the results of that audit?

**MR. GAMMAGE:** The equipment in question was the two ATVs, the dirt bike and the trailer, correct?

**CHAIR SAVINO:** Not only that all of the stuff. There was some more stuff. There was – there were several pieces of equipment. Not just the two ATVs. We had – there've been four ATVs given. In the original concept of the program there was – we did grant one ATV – no, two ATVs, excuse me! Two ATVs were granted on the original program. It's gone – it's multiplied to four ATVs – uhm just on and on and on. Let me get this. Bear with me a second.

There were eight trailers that had been purchased by the Ambassador Program. That's gone from one trailer. There are eight trailers out there. There are four ATVs. There are two dirt bikes out there. There's a Razor out there. We've been putting in equipment to – we bought stabilizers for BLM's vehicles, you know, to – for towing and stuff like that. This is taking it away from what the original concept is.

What I questioned at that governing council meeting was, where is that stuff? What's happened to all that equipment and you said at the time that there was going to be – here it is. Okay? Eight trailers -- the equipment for the trailers comes to \$53,233. That's propane generators, all kinds of stuff. Okay? Four ATVs, two dirt bikes, a Polaris Razor with all the extra equipment – extra suspension and everything – is \$20,000. Where is all that equipment and how did it get to – from a "meet-and-greet" to that – and the volunteers are responsible for their own equipment – their own stuff.

**MR. GAMMAGE:** Right! And I can only speak to the stuff that's at the BLM office. We don't have eight trailers, we don't have –

**CHAIR SAVINO:** No, excuse me. You have to speak for everything. You are the coordinator of this program. You are the person that we go to. So don't say that you can only speak for that; because then that tells me that you aren't aware of what happens to the other.

**MR. GAMMAGE:** But I'm not the one who purchases everything. You have to remember I don't manage the entire fund.

**CHAIR SAVINO:** You manage the program and –

**MR. GAMMAGE:** I manage the program. I don't have all of the funds for the program.

**CHAIR SAVINO:** Okay, no, that's not the answer – when we pay you this much money that we're paying you for all this –

**MR. GAMMAGE:** You paid some directly to the Forest Service in the past. I can't account for the money that the Forest Service got. I don't work for the Forest Service. So I can't say whether that equipment is – if it was provided to the Forest Service.

**CHAIR SAVINO:** So then our – then we fall back on – why are we giving this money. We should stop it because if people can't answer for this stuff –

**MR. BALDWIN:** Mr. Chair?

**CHAIR SAVINO:** Yes, Bob.

**MR. BALDWIN:** We have eight trailers. The Cave Creek Ranger District has a bunch of trailers. The BLM Field Office has two massive trailers. There's one small trailer that was purchased to haul dirt bikes and ATVs by law enforcement groups. That equipment is also at BLM. Then the other four trailers are the ones we purchased last year, two of them are with Community Forest Trust, the other one is with CREC and one is at BLM now; but it will be used in the east valley area. So that's your eight trailers.

They also purchased two ATVs for law enforcement use; and those are at the BLM Field Office.

**CHAIR SAVINO:** Wait a minute! Stop right there. I'll let you continue; but I want to interrupt so I can get on these points.

You just said they purchased what now for law enforcement? An ATV?

**MR. BALDWIN:** When the program was first developed, the law enforcement coordinator for the BLM was the coordinator for the BLM as far as the program was concerned. He was the one who was providing input and helping to develop the structure of the program and what the Ambassadors would do; and what kind of restrictions they would have and what kind of training they would need, et cetera, et cetera. He was granted money to develop the program. He purchased that equipment. He is the law enforcement person.

At that time, all the equipment was available for their law enforcement used in coordination with the program to do patrols and be available when the Ambassadors were out in the field. That equipment is still at BLM. It kind of has a law enforcement tag on it although it's clear in our agreement with them that it was not provided for strictly law enforcement use and it can be reallocated.

**CHAIR SAVINO:** Wait a minute! Bob, what do you mean? Who gave the authority to give that – who approved it -- to give that equipment to law enforcement?

**MR. BALDWIN:** Like I said, the law enforcement person was the Chris Gammage at that time.

**CHAIR SAVINO:** So he just had cart blanche, no overseeing from State Parks on getting this equipment and doing what he pleased?

**MR. BALDWIN:** He submitted a request for equipment that was approved by –

**CHAIR SAVINO:** Not OHVAG.

**MR. BALDWIN:** By the Parks Board or whatever. The money was funded to BLM under the same type of working agreement – the work order that we're doing right now.

**CHAIR SAVINO:** I think what I'm trying to do is to say that –

**MR. BALDWIN:** We know where everything we bought is. Now it's not all being used directly, every day, today, in the Ambassador program; and we can take steps to see that that does happen. But we know where all the equipment is. It's all accounted for. It's all available for use.

**CHAIR SAVINO:** Well it wasn't at the governing council meeting when I asked. I wanted to go down the next day and you didn't know where the stuff was. Some of it was locked up from a law enforcement LEO – it was locked up somewhere.

**MR. GAMMAGE:** We do know where it all is now.

**CHAIR SAVINO:** Bill Gibson.

**MR. GIBSON:** Yes, I wanted to clarify something.

**MR. BALDWIN:** Stand up so we can hear you.

**MR. GIBSON:** The ATVs and the motorcycles that you just asked about that are still being used. They're being used, for instance, at the Boulders or Table Mesa; which is in the Hassayampa Field Office and other parts of the Hassayampa Field Office by law enforcement people.

**CHAIR SAVINO:** No, wait! There's my whole point. Okay? I understand and I'm not disputing that they are used; and if you say you have the equipment, that's fine. I understand that. Okay? What I am questioning is how we went from a "meet-and-greet" program to funding law enforcement. That bike – those bikes should not – and even let's go one step further. We're not even funding law enforcement, we're funding a *federal* law enforcement agency for their equipment to go out and ride. Okay? You didn't even say when you just stated this – they're being used at the meet-and-greets for the Ambassador Program by law enforcement. They're being used on a regular basis by law enforcement. That wasn't the intent of it.

**MR. GAMMAGE:** Are their uses meet-and-greet?

**CHAIR SAVINO:** No, that wasn't the intent. They should have been parked when they're not being used by that meet-and-greet. I just don't know how we came from – the whole point – go ahead, Hank.

**MR. ROGERS:** I just – here's my major heartburn here; and you know, I think you guys have done an ample job of answering. You know, you found the stuff. I do have some concerns, Bill, if they're being used for law enforcement rather than for Ambassadors only. I think that's –

**MR. GIBSON:** Let me clarify it. The original intent of the program – we had law enforcement people out there going out with the Ambassadors, so – they would go out for meet-and-greets; but then –

**CHAIR SAVINO:** Don't they have their own equipment? What do they use for their own equipment?

**MR. GIBSON:** At the time they did not. So, this was part of the program.

Let me give you my perspective because I was in on some of the organizational meetings at the beginning as well; and the original perspective was we expressed a concern that we do not have enough boots on the ground as land managers to work and interface with the users. For better or for worse, we've got problems out there. So we came to State Parks with this notice – Forest Service, BLM, State Lands – saying, can we use some of the Sticker Money – at the time it was gas tax money – to help us get boots on the ground and interface with some of the users. So the idea was spawned that we would use the users themselves to do these meet-and-greets – and not just meet-and-greets; but go out and do project work, ride the trails as it's been said – and yes, the program has evolved.

It's evolved over the past five years to what we have now. The equipment is being used for meet-and-greets, but it's also being used for trail work and for patrol work –

**CHAIR SAVINO:** For law enforcement.

**MR. GIBSON:** Yeah, law enforcement gets into the mix; because when you send a law enforcement person out and something goes on, he's gotta respond. He's got a dirt bike or an ATV he's better able to move around on some of those roads – primitive roads and trails.

**CHAIR SAVINO:** And I understand, okay?

**MR. GIBSON:** So, yes, the program has evolved. Maybe –

**CHAIR SAVINO:** The program has evolved, but you have to understand, when I go back and talk to different – our club and different constituents and I tell them that, "Hey, you guys are giving" – they ask, "Where are our OHV dollars going?" When I mention well – it's over \$1.6 million actually that going to law enforcement, from the HURF and from the Sticker Money going to Game and Fish for law enforcement – they're our state law enforcement agency, okay? You're giving that money – we're also – we're giving grants out for two Razors for the Sheriff's Department in Coconino County; a Razor for Tonto law year; four Rangers or five Rangers for Game and Fish.

**MR. GIBSON:** Let me get you a little perspective. We manage 12 million acres in this state. Forest Service manages 15 million acres. That's 27 million acres of land. As near as I can tell, we've got tens of thousands of users out there on those lands every year and they are using – BLM – 42,000 miles of roads. So when we said we needed more boots on the ground and we had law enforcement step up to the plate and say, "We will be back up. We don't want the Ambassadors to do law enforcement. We will be there as a back up."

**CHAIR SAVINO:** Well let me finish.

**MR. GIBSON:** They need to get out there and provide that back up; and they need a means by which they can get out there and move around on the trails.

**CHAIR SAVINO:** If it doesn't seem that important to you, then don't send them out. I mean, you have a budget for your law enforcement people. BLM has a budget.

Okay, you do. Okay? You hired those law enforcement people for a certain – specific thing. Now you’re asking for the state to supply the equipment for those people. There’s something wrong with that picture. The fines that come back, they don’t even come back to the state. It doesn’t even come back into our general fund or anything.

What we’re doing is – you’re asking for – and I can see why because it’s been mentioned by people, “Well, law enforcement likes the Ambassador Program.” You’re doggone right they do! When we started this program – if you look at the list there, \$25,000 for an outing for – let’s see, most of them are like in the \$4,500 range – to hire BLM or Forest Ranger to come out – a law enforcement person – we’re not only supplying the equipment for them, we’re paying them overtime to come out and do the job.

What happened to the thing where – if our club goes out there and we’re on the Forest Service and we have a ride like we have this coming weekend; and I see somebody illegally dumping, okay? I call on the phone the forest ranger and I say, “You have somebody out here illegally dumping.” Okay? That person is obligated because that’s their forest – they come out there and take care of that. But yet what we’re doing with this program, we’re paying overtime to get that person to come out to sit around waiting. The program – when we got the concept of the program when they wanted to expand it; all that was a needed was a person on call from that specific area – the Hassayampa Ranger District would agree to have a BLM Ranger – law enforcement person available.

**MR. GIBSON:** That’s how it works.

**CHAIR SAVINO:** That’s the way it works. Okay. But you’re paying that person overtime; and you’re paying for his equipment.

**MR. GIBSON:** I don’t think they’re paying our Rangers overtime. I don’t know about the Forest Service. The program’s not paying our Rangers overtime.

**CHAIR SAVINO:** Well it did for years. You know it did.

**MR. GIBSON:** That was another agreement.

**CHAIR SAVINO:** That was part of the original agreement. That was – well, it’s law enforcement, okay? And it may not be BLM employees. We were paying law enforcement to come out there; and I don’t feel it’s fair to have the Ambassador Program to subsidize law enforcement or subsidize the equipment to do that work.

**MR. GAMMAGE:** That was the beginning – the initial underpinnings of the program, so –

**CHAIR SAVINO:** Yeah, I know.

**MR. GAMMAGE:** Now we’ve got to change the paradigm.

**CHAIR SAVINO:** Yeah I want to change the paradigm or do away with it because if we don’t change it it’s going to go away. We have to review what we’re doing



and look seriously. None of us want to do away with the program; but we need to look at it, though.

**MS. DWYER:** Mr. Chairman?

**CHAIR SAVINO:** Yes ma'am.

**MS. DWYER:** I'd like to go back to a comment that was made and rightly so. The question you asked was, "So what have we gotten because we had this program? What's been the outcome?" I'd like to just summarize. Put a picture of the State of Arizona in your mind. At the present, these are the places where we have this program and along with that program on these particular land management areas we have a hundred volunteers now who are trained to work, not only in those forests, but anywhere else in the state; because the program has that kind of consistency. That's because how – that's how you attract and keep volunteers. Folks like to ride in different places at different times of the year.

So we have the Cave Creek Ranger District, the Hassayampa Field Office – and that is Table Mesa as well as the Boulders – we have Middle Gila Canyons, a major OHV area; we have all of the Coconino National Forest, we have all of the Prescott National Forest, we have the South Kaibab involved in the program. Take a look in your mind's eye of the state. That's a tremendous amount of area that we are now covering with the program with a hundred volunteers. We constantly are recruiting volunteers. Those volunteers are the meet-and-greets; they're the ones who do the patrolling and give the information back – just as Jeff described – back to the Forest Service. They're the ones who know the trails and give information back to the land and resource managers about what should be done, how it should be done, where it should be done; but also help them with special projects like "re-vegging," like putting signs up, like kiosk and fence repair and kiosk construction.

Right now many of these forests – I can speak to the Coconino which will come out with the new trail management plan in January. Prescott already has its new trail management plan out. Kaibab also has its new trail management plan out; and Middle Gila does as well. They desperately need these volunteers to educate the public about what that looks like and to help get these new trails and these new staging areas, these new kiosks and signs up so that people will know where to ride and will be able to enjoy that experience.

So when you think about outcome, get a picture of your –

**CHAIR SAVINO:** Okay, but I am –

**MR. PFEIFER:** I have a comment.

**CHAIR SAVINO:** Go ahead, Pete.

**MR. PFEIFER:** She doesn't have to defend the program. We understand its accomplishments and we totally support everything that she said. We totally support that. It's just some of the abuses, I guess you might say, and some of the equipment that we're concerned about; and just kind of keeping track of the

program. OHVAG has sort of been left out of the loop on this stuff; so we just need to be, you know, informed on this stuff on a more timely basis.

**CHAIR SAVINO:** I'd like to add to that a little bit; but first I'm gonna have Hank – 'cuz Hank was raising his hand.

**MR. ROGERS:** My heartburn over this – I don't want to see this become so big that it takes up all of our dollars. That's my concern. That's why we need to have this discussion. We need to make sure this doesn't encompass every dollar that we have. Because more important to me than any of this is getting some places for our people to ride – quality places for our people to ride. That's where I want to see these dollars go – the bulk of these dollars go – in maintaining those places that we've established.

You know what? This is the issue. I echo that, too. I think it reminds you, Mr. Chair, that it's starting to snow up in North --

**CHAIR SAVINO:** Well, this is important right now. We've got another – at least another hour before we get to the other thing. So, Hank, I'll dig out – I'll follow you and dig you out.

**MR. ROGERS:** Okay.

**CHAIR SAVINO:** I have to agree, we're not – you don't have to defend the program. Okay? One thing I have – and like I say, I'm usually blunt when I talk – my problem is I feel we've got too many chiefs and not enough Indians. We don't have enough people out there doing it – the OHV people doing it. Out on the grounds where we need them, we have – I'm looking at the – I added up for the year 2000 – some of this was before your time, okay? In the years 2000 – 2007 to 2008 the people – Marge and Katie Myers from the Advanced Resource Solutions – when you go on to them – Chris' pay – and at that we had Amy Racki's pay involved in that; and I'm not even counting Amy's pay.

We had \$97,896 go towards labor for a volunteer organization – that's \$96,000. That was in that time. Then in 2009 we had Chris' at \$52,000 and Marge's and Katie's – mostly Marge's – at \$70,000. In 2010 we had \$68,000. That's the money that was spent on labor for three people, plus Amy which I didn't – I didn't count. It's hard to break that out on the thing – and Troy was involved in that during that time. So we had five people overseeing that program.

**MS. DWYER:** You don't have that now.

**CHAIR SAVINO:** We don't have it and I said at the beginning, I said I can't – you know – you are trying to control this. But I see that you don't have that now, but you do have that now. I'm gonna rephrase it. You have Robert Kline sitting back there who's getting paid to do the project. They're hiring another person – wherever the money comes from for Community Forest Trust on that thing. So you still – you have too many chiefs and not enough Indians. We have to overlook that. I mean, we have to look at that whole picture there. That's way – an exorbitant amount of money that was being spent – and I'm going back to the

thing – I don't want to have this program get outta hand to where we have to shut it down because of how it's gone way wild. Okay?

**MS. DWYER:** Mr. Chairman, the way that you could balance that is if we could get more OHV riders to be Ambassadors. Because then we would have more of their work on the ground, and more – there's a way to train them –

**CHAIR SAVINO:** But I'm gonna go back – Marge, I'm gonna go back to what David said earlier; maybe there's a reason why the OHV – the people don't wanna do it. Now maybe a lot of them just are lazy and they don't want to go out and do things –

**MS. DWYER:** Your company has also contributed to that, I'm afraid.

**CHAIR SAVINO:** Well, but yes – but those dollars are still coming in from those people and we have to answer to those people. David?

**MR. MOORE:** Well, is it the responsibility of OHVAG or of the OHV Ambassador Program to concentrate our recruitment?

**MS. DWYER:** We do!

**MR. MOORE:** So, maybe the money should not be spent in hiring labor or anything else; but on advertising, promotion and those things in order to get the volunteers, first. And then –

**CHAIR SAVINO:** You have to take into consideration who do you want them to get, because they have been really good and diligent in getting groups. They got CREC and Community Forest Trust. So you have to also put in the thing there, what do you want? Be careful what you ask for, because you might get it.

**MR. MOORE:** I understand. What I want is – and I'm not nearly as concerned about groups or clubs or anything. The vast majority of OHV users in the State of Arizona are individuals. I would like to see individuals be part of the thing and not necessarily representing anything other than the greater good of OHV use. I don't know exactly how to entice those people. I know that there are many, many people – you know, all of us are a part of that – that are very, you know, strong supporters of OHV. I would like to, you know, focus on drawing those people in with their varied experiences and their varied needs for the OHV use to be Ambassadors. I'd like to see it build in that way, from individuals.

Instead of a hundred, you know, why don't we have a thousand or ten thousand individual persons – at least have some association, you know, with the program; say their part and, you know, be a part of the program.

**MS. DWYER:** Help us recruit. We'll be happy to do that.

**CHAIR SAVINO:** Well, I guess to sum it up – because I'm not going to talk about the past. A lot of it you can't control. What's done is done. But we can work on the future with this. One of the things you came to us with is this 2012 Grant Application Manual. Okay?

Do we want to take the time now?

**MR. BALDWIN:** Mr. Chair, that's a separate item later in the agenda.

**CHAIR SAVINO:** Okay.

**MR. BALDWIN:** It's one o'clock so we have people on the podium.

**CHAIR SAVINO:** Okay, let's – thank you very much for the input. I think you heard a lot from us and we're all in favor of the program.

**MR. GIBSON:** I have to go to another meeting. So do Chris and Marge and I don't want to leave on a sour note. We really are appreciative of your support and the support of the OHV community. I think we're a lot better off than we were in many respects in those areas where the program has worked; but whatever problems we have I think we can work them out.

**CHAIR SAVINO:** I think so. I think that we need to work on that and I feel that we can. We all wanna have that program going. Let's just work toward getting there.

**MR. MOORE:** Can I make one minor suggestion that may work? Maybe we could allocate a very small amount of dollars and create a thing so we can give information on the Ambassador Program with the purchase of every new off-highway vehicle. Give that and see if we can work with the dealers or whatever and just hand that out to each individual who buys it; so that they know it's a part and maybe they want to be a part of it.

**MS. DWYER:** Well if Bill Nash were here – quite frankly I have worked with him in the past to do just that. If this expansion grant goes forward – because now there are some changes in it and Bob will take care of that – I intend to be on the phone with him on Monday along with other motor sports dealers to help us recruit and promote Ambassadors, as well as for expansion grants. So, that's a very good idea.

**MR. ROGERS:** I have a suggestion, also. Come to us when you get ready to expand. Talk to us. We know people all over the state.

**MS. DWYER:** You'll hear from us next week.

**MR. ROGERS:** We'll be more than happy to share our contacts with you; and you know, maybe we can find the people who are users and very passionate about it.

**MR. BALDWIN:** You have the grant manual. All you need to do is put it in their hands and tell them to contact us.

**CHAIR SAVINO:** Okay, I have one more comment. Go ahead.

**MR. PALMER:** Tom Palmer from Prescott NF. I just wanted say I've been listening to the discussion and we talked about benefits. To a land manager, for me – I manage the recreation resources in my District and at least half of the Prescott NF. We've been involved with the process for the last – about three-quarters of the way through the year. We've had four successful events. We're still kind of in its infancy, I would say – at least in Prescott. We're not as advanced as the

pilot program here; but we're working on that. We're getting so much support from the OHV community, the users there in the Prescott Valley.

I've been at every event – well, except for one. I've been to those events. I interact with those folks and I participate. I see the benefit that it is to them, personally – the users. Not just ourselves – because they're of huge benefit to us – disregard that – the benefit to them to be able to come out, ride a trail, see a piece of country, feel like they're doing something to say what they love to do really gives them a lot of ownership in what they're doing; and at the same time when we're out talking to people – other ATV, Jeep, motorized users – and we're spreading that message – they're spreading that message.

We're getting comments from the public from those interactions saying "This is great! Do more of this!" both from an information standpoint – "this is where you can ride." We pass out the maps. You know, information is power. These folks, the Ambassadors, are providing this power to the communities. A lot of folks that we interact with don't know that we have a legal system of roads and trails on the Prescott. Just providing that piece of information is huge to them. It kind of empowers them to keep doing good work in telling their friends.

That advice – what I've seen in the past four events – is really reflected in the actual Ambassadors themselves, the joy and excitement they get about coming out. Now we're a little slow behind the curve and we're in the process of developing core team members, those key members of the OHV community who really want to play a more active role in the OHV program and just OHV in general.

So as we go through the year, and hopefully the next year, we will continue to build on those relationships, get those key people in place where we can expand. I'm like – the whole concept that I talked to Bob about and that he's mentioned several times, that this program is going to be self-sustaining after three years. We got \$25,000 to start the program; and after that period, CFT, CREC and the other groups can continue that. I mean, CFT has gone with secured grants to get ATVs so they can be involved. Bruce doesn't have an ATV so he said, "Let's get a grant." So we have a machine now that I can use at these events.

Now they seem like, as Marge said, we need a person who's dedicated to the OHV world. So they've applied for another grant – outside dollars to fund this program, essentially. So, I don't know – it's just a comment of support for the program and the work that you've done here. I know there are a lot of paths. Surely there are some things we can do to shore up –

**CHAIR SAVINO:** Tom, one of the things that would help us out – and I'm going to ask again, please, I would like a list – and I would like you to send it to each one of the Off-Highway Vehicle Advisory Group members – a list of when these "meet-and-greets" or whatever you have out there so we can have – I really feel that a lot of what – the problems that we're having, that I'm having, is not understanding; not being able to get out and see what's going on out there. Once

I see that. I go up there and I get up in the CREC area and I see what's happening; then – "hey, this is good!" We have to understand that.

So I've asked – I'm asking again, please give that to us. Then we can show up and see what the heck's going on.

**MS. DWYER:** That – Chris can do that for you.

**MR. PFEIFER:** I have a follow up.

**CHAIR SAVINO:** Go ahead. Pete?

**MR. PFEIFER:** As far as meets-and-greets, they can go to the Super Carts Race up there in Phoenix. There're 60,000/80,000 people up there they can basically pass their information out to. Also to Hank's ATV Jamborees, the best ATV venue, I would think, to reach the ATV crowd. Those would be two great events that they could work.

**MS. DWYER:** Okay, thank you.

**CHAIR SAVINO:** Okay. Thank you. Thank you very much, Tom.  
I have Robert Kline. Did you wanna talk?

**MR. KLINE:** I just wanted to back up what Tom was saying. You just talked about coming up to CREC. That's what you need to do. There seems to be a lot of issues – your group seems to have a lot of issues with CREC. You need to come and see what CREC's all about.

**CHAIR SAVINO:** Yeah, and like I mentioned, I don't have any issues with you. I've talked to enough people and looked – I can tell you what you're wearing.

**MR. KLINE:** Yeah, I know. We know a lot of the same people. That part I'm not even worried about – as far as my credibility. I know what I've done. I know what I've accomplished; so I'm not going to push that. But what I see with the program is that you need an organization like CREC to get this going.

Like Bob said – and I've heard everybody else saying here – where are the off-road people? I'm there every day talking to them; but they're not going in on the program. You need a group like CREC or somebody like me to keep presenting it and it's going to take a while.

**CHAIR SAVINO:** I'm wondering why that – Thomas, are you still there?

**MR. McARTHUR:** Yes I am.

**CHAIR SAVINO:** Thomas, how come the Coconino – how come your group up there – the trial riders – haven't gotten involved with the CREC on this thing? That would solve a lot of stuff.

**MR. McARTHUR:** Well we have some contacts, because Robert has been to our meetings; but frankly the CTR group is involved with a couple different projects involving their club in designing and laying out new trails. So that is where our efforts are going at this juncture.

**CHAIR SAVINO:** Okay, where I wanted – why I brought that up – and then I’m going to end it this way so we can get on with the next portion of this – bring back the subject of “why aren’t these groups getting out there?” There are reasons why these groups – there’s a group up there, there are trail riders, there are reasons why. We need to look into that.

**MS. DWYER:** We will!

**CHAIR SAVINO:** Okay. Thank you very much, Tom – Robert.

## **F. OHVAG ACTION ITEMS**

**1. (Time Certain Item @ 1 PM) Review and Consider Requests from Tonto National Forest and Kaibab National Forests to Extend the Project End Dates for Their Recreational Trails Program OHV Project Grants and From the Coconino National Forest to Extend the Project End Date and Add a New Scope Item to their Off-Highway Vehicle Recreation Fund Project. – Representatives for the projects will report on the current status of the projects and explain why additional time is needed to complete the projects. These are first time extensions and project scope modifications that are not required under the Administrative Guidelines for Awarded Grants to be approved by the Parks Board.**

**CHAIR SAVINO:** Okay, I’m going to move on to the next thing. I have to move on because this is the 1:00 p.m. thing that was scheduled on the thing. What it is – “The OHVAG will review and consider requests from Tonto National Forest and Kaibab National Forest to extend the project and dates for their recreational trails program, OHV project grants; and from the Coconino National Forest to extend the project end date and add a new scope item to their OHV recreation Project Fund.”

Okay, first of all, do we have anybody here from the Tonto – is that the first one we have there?

**MR. BALDWIN:** Amy, are you on the phone?

**MS. RACKI:** Yeah, I’m on the phone here.

**MR. BALDWIN:** Mr. Chair, your report for F-1 – this is our new format for our reports that we initiated – what the Parks Board does – which allows us to move from your recommendations into their recommendations in the same format. So it looks a little different than it has in the past. At the beginning of the item we do mention the motion. If someone could make the motion and open it up for discussion; or we can do as we’ve normally done, go ahead and go through the discussion; because someone will eventually make the motion and you will need to vote on the recommendation. Obviously this is the recommended motion. You can change the motion any way you like; so, keep that in mind.

In the status part, we’ve talked about what’s gone on with these grants in the past, how they came about. Last year at this time, we had the project extensions and you said, “We wanna have our say any time you have a project extension.” Typically these would be what we call administrative changes and we would just

do these with the signature of the project sponsor and the executive staff. So right now we're asking for you – for each of the project sponsors to explain where their project is at; and why they need the extension, and have an opportunity for you to ask any questions.

Ami Racki is on the phone. She is the representative at the Tonto National Forest and she has an appointment shortly. She's got a PowerPoint – Amy I'm on your PowerPoint cover page there with the Forest Service logo. If you want to walk us through it, go ahead.

**MS. RACKI:** [The quality of the audio is very poor.] Okay. I wanna first apologize that I'm on the phone. I'm gonna take about five minutes doing this. I will go through this quick and then we'll just take a couple minutes.

I'm Amy Racki from the Tonto National Forest. We have two grants that we're requesting to extend. Next slide. One is the Rolls Grant. It's the OHV access control zone and grant from the RTP Fund; and the second one is the OHV Fund Improvements. I'm going to go through both of these.

We're going to start with the first one. Next slide. The RTP Grant, OHV access control development – the components of it was to install gates and steel rail surrounding those. Install kiosk and interpretative signs. Next slide. We've installed five gates at Butcher Jones. Next slide. We also installed 2,318 linear feet of metal rails surrounding these gates. Next slide. We've completed \$28,180 – almost \$30,000 in grant match requirements on our peer projects. Next slide. This is like a before and after of the re-vegetation with volunteers. Next slide.

We're currently designing interpretative panels. These are examples of the interpretative panels we've just installed at the Superstition Wilderness. We wanted to make a nice designed panels [unintelligible]. Next slide. We've installed temporary signs at two new parking lots that we've just built in conjunction with Arizona Department of Transportation. These temporary signs are laminated maps; so we just have some information up while our interpretative panels are being designed. I just wanted to make note that these interpretative signs will supplement a new brochure that we have. Bob, if you could pass around those two brochures.

This is the Yamaha Grant given to the TRAL, which is our nonprofit OHV organization that we work closely with. I just wanted to show you that the project – if we could go to the next slide – basically this project is one piece of the puzzle. It's in conjunction with this new brochure; we've built two or three new staging areas; we need to do more signage; we're designing turnarounds and turnabouts at different sites; we're improving the old OHV sites. We do about five volunteer projects a week. This grant is just one of many projects that are going on.

The total approved grant award for the OHV access control development was \$270,191. To do this project work we've spent last year almost all of it with the exception of \$82,000. The next slide please? We requested to extend it one year to January 2013. The reason why is that the economy is poor and we over-



estimated the needs and the amount of rails; so we want to put those unexpended funds toward either signs or additional gates. We're also working on some minor sign changes on the ground; and instead of just buying kiosks and installing them on the ground with minimal information; we're developing more interpretative signs which involve more graphic design and it's very expensive. We also – this project was delayed a year. It didn't even get off the ground until 2010, and really more so just this past year, and that's obviously our fault.

So that is the first agreement extension. So Bob we should be on the next slide which is State OHV Fund.

**CHAIR SAVINO:** I have a question. Before we go any further, Amy, this is John Savino. I have a couple questions on this one in particular – this grant.

During the last grant cycle the Mesa Ranger District presented us with a grant request for basically the Willow Fly Catcher. You were in the area and you were going to – you wanted fencing, metal railing and gates to, you know, keep people – keep OHVs out of that area where the Willow Fly Catcher is. Are you familiar with that grant?

**MS. RACKI:** Yeah.

**CHAIR SAVINO:** Are these railings and gates going to be used in that area?

**MS. RACKI:** This has nothing to do with that area. The main areas that we're focusing on here are, Lower Sycamore, Upper Sycamore, the ????, which basically a lot of people call that the player area of Sycamore. The Rolls OHV area and [inaudible]. You see all of those in that brochure. The area that [inaudible] presented to you guys was Hewitt, which is a growing OHV area which we haven't really addressed yet; because we are the highest OHV District use – OHV use in the nation of all the national forests. So, one step at a time.

**CHAIR SAVINO:** Okay, I just wanted to make sure. Because what we did was we turned down that request – that grant request for the Whitlow [phonetic] Ranch Flood Control Basin Restoration Project; and I just wanted to make sure the equipment isn't going to be used for that; and you're saying it isn't. Correct?

**MS. RACKI:** Correct!

**CHAIR SAVINO:** Okay, Bob, go ahead. Amy?

**MS. RACKI:** Then the second project is the OHV -- it's called the Rolls OHV Site Improvements to install – basically fence and pipe rail. We've been working on that project for a while and this just continues that project.

We completed the construction of 3,100 feet of wire fence – 9,300 linear feet. We have done over 100,000 square feet of land. Installed route markers. We're able to basically install route markers across 50 miles of road within the last month. We constructed more than 500 feet of steel rail and installed signage. We place temporary signage on that. Next slide.

This OHV grant was for \$60,250. Essentially we priced it around \$40,000 so we have about \$20,000 left to spend. Next slide. This just shows a picture of some of the steel rails defining the staging area. Next slide. We installed this kiosk, which was not charged to the grant. This is a matching from us; and we did put temporary signs on it.

**CHAIR SAVINO:** This is John again. I don't see anywhere on that – on the kiosk where it says anything about off-highway vehicle sticker decal money has funded these projects.

**MS. RACKI:** Yeah and that actually is going to be a map panel that says, "OHV Partnership," and I think it may be on this map here. I can't see that well. I just have a printout. These are temporary so the nice interpretative panels on the big map will say, "Partnership –

[End of tape.]

**MS. RACKI:** . . . "Your OHV dollars at work," or something like that. So that is part of the final design. The next slide. Essentially we need one year to do this project. We're going to try to aim for July. Once again, it's not as useful as interpretative panels; so, if we really wanted to get this out by January, sure we could; but if we wanna do this right and we want to make it user friendly for the public. Next slide. We'd like to extend both of these grants. One one-year out; and one about six months out; and that's the end of my presentation.

**CHAIR SAVINO:** All right, does anybody else have any questions for Amy?

[No verbal response.]

**CHAIR SAVINO:** Okay, Amy, thank you very much. You can go to your doctor's appointment.

**MS. RACKI:** Okay, thank you so much; and I apologize once again and thank you all for your concern and look forward to seeing you at some point in the future.

**CHAIR SAVINO:** Okay, thank you. With that said, I'm going to open it up for discussion on these two. Do any of the OHVAG members have any comments before we go to a vote on these?

**MR. MOORE:** I agree. I've seen – the projects that she's proposed seem reasonable to spend the money that's already been allocated. I just want to say I agree with it.

**CHAIR SAVINO:** Okay, I have one. I'm on the fence on this. Part of me says, "just go ahead," you know, "it's a good cost." The other part of me says that we awarded a specific amount of money for a specific project. We reviewed the project and went on. Now they're asking for – it didn't come within the realm. Part of me says that that money should go back into the fund for other projects; and then if they want it – because they're essentially doing more projects – that that money should go back into the fund and then be rated; because now maybe that rating wouldn't be as high as some other ones coming in.

**MR. MOORE:** Do we have a mechanism for that?

**CHAIR SAVINO:** Bob? Do we – what happens if that money – if all the money isn't used, would it revert back into the OHV Fund?

**MR. BALDWIN:** Yes.

**AAG HERNBRODE:** Mr. Chairman, you said that you thought they had expanded their project?

**MR. BALDWIN:** Yes, they did ask to.

**CHAIR SAVINO:** Yes, they're asking to expand it and I'm saying, "Our original agreement was for this – this here," and that's what we agreed on. At the time we agreed on that we also had other projects in line that we also reviewed. Now they want to expand it – does that throw them in front of the line of other projects coming in? I'm not sure that's fair.

I think that – I feel that with what she said, those projects will – if they come back in front of us, we'll approve 'em; but it's still – it's only fair to the other projects out there that –

**MR. ROGERS:** They should have to – do they want more money? Is that what you're saying?

**MR. MOORE:** They spent less than they estimated.

**CHAIR SAVINO:** No, they wanna use – they only used \$100,000 of the \$200,000.

**MR. MOORE:** They want to use the rest of money we've already allocated.

**CHAIR SAVINO:** So, if they didn't use it; that money should come back in because – back into the fund to be reviewed for another project.

**MR. BALDWIN:** Mr. Chair?

**CHAIR SAVINO:** Bob.

**MR. BALDWIN:** We tried to do that – streamline this process and make it as easy as possible to get money out and on the ground. So right now you're telling them that, "Even though you have momentum going on this project" –

**MR. MOORE:** That's what I'm saying.

**MR. BALDWIN:** . . . you've got an application, we've approved the funding and we're not planning on that money to give out for another purpose; we want you to stop, give us the money back and put in a new application and start all over.

**CHAIR SAVINO:** Okay, that's the other half of me – I said I had half – you know, part of me – I was on the fence. That's the other side of the fence – and I agree with you. I see both sides.

So now what I wanna do – I – let me do this. You wanna separate them into each one?

**MR. BALDWIN:** I didn't really have the second project. I had their RTP Grant Project on here; but I didn't really have their Sticker Fund Project on here for extension.

**CHAIR SAVINO:** We can't talk about it then.

**MR. BALDWIN:** So, you can approve this one motion which is their RTP Grant money.

**CHAIR SAVINO:** Which is the – which one? Tell me which one?

**MR. BALDWIN:** That was the gates and the pipe rail portion.

**CHAIR SAVINO:** Okay. I'd like to entertain a motion, then. If we don't agree on it, I'm going to ask for a discussion on the thing. Okay?

I'd like to entertain a motion that the "Off-Highway Vehicle Advisory Group extend the project end date for the Tonto National Forest, Mesa Ranger District Recreational Trails Program" – we need to cut that down; that's too much – "Motorized Project #470802 Off-Highway Vehicle Access Control Development by 12 months to January 23, 2013; and expand the scope of the project to include additional gates, metal rail; and /or signs to expand the full amount of the original grant."

**MR. ROGERS:** I so move.

**CHAIR SAVINO:** Okay, let's say I change my thing to "move" instead of entertain a motion. Okay, I move. There's too much stuff.

**AAG HERNBRODE:** So he's seconding?

**CHAIR SAVINO:** He's seconded it, now I wanna vote. Before I have a vote, I wanna have a discussion.

**MR. ROGERS:** So, you made the motion then?

**CHAIR SAVINO:** I made the motion. I'd like to have a discussion. Is there any discussion on this?

**MR. MOORE:** A little bit. In some ways I'm pleased that an agency like Amy's part of was able to accomplish all of their goals on time and under budget, essentially. I think that bodes well for the whole program a little bit. On the other hand – not on the other hand, but the other point is exactly what Bob said, I think once you have a lot of the old mechanism in motion there's the economy – the end user is going to get more signage, rails, fences and everything by having them continue on with what they're doing and use it up. You know, any time you have the back and forth, you're adding in this other layer.

I do understand the fairness of what you're saying. However, if we discussed and agreed on a specific amount; if they give us the full value for our money and the project is valid, and they can support what they're asking for; I think that they should continue.

**CHAIR SAVINO:** Okay, I wanna put in one more caveat to this. Okay? When we – originally, when any grant comes in front of us, all OHVAG members – we research where specifically these gates – when they mention gates and railings, we are conscious about putting gates and railings – blocking off a trail that exists. Okay? So here – and we’ve done that with the original project. Here they’re asking for money, and we’re relying on them. We’re just giving them that without seeing where specifically that bridge or that gate is going.

Now it may be going where we don’t want it to. So are we just – are we creating something? So there are different ways to look at this. Anybody have any – any other comments?

**MR. PFEIFER:** Can I just make one?

**CHAIR SAVINO:** Yes. Pete.

**MR. PFEIFER:** Yeah I was just going to say it sounds like Ami was hustling and that she’s actually trying to cut out a little bit better project – or product in the end. I would have to assume that her heart’s in the right place – that she needed to put in additional gates and railing.

**CHAIR SAVINO:** Okay.

**MR. ROGERS:** Comment?

**CHAIR SAVINO:** Yes.

**MR. ROGERS:** I say just ask Amy to run it by Bob and send it out to us what she’s going to do with this other here.

**CHAIR SAVINO:** Well, we can’t – before we approve it?

**MR. ROGERS:** Go ahead and approve it and ask her to respond – I don’t know, what are you going to do? I guess you can push it back – push it back in the next meeting.

**CHAIR SAVINO:** Okay, I’d like to recognize – before I recognize Bob Baldwin, I’d like to recognize Jeff Gursh.

**MR. GURSH:** Question and a concern at the same time. Let’s say that we have a limited amount of money this next cycle. Say we only \$1 million in the pot and I wanna submit a grant for \$500,000. I really only need \$200,000 of it; but I’m going to say I need more so that in the end, like here, I can say, “Guess what? I finished under budget; but I have all these other projects I wanna do.”

Now, I know it’s – that’s something that we don’t wanna think about; but it sets a precedent for someone to use more – ask for more than they can use knowing that they would be allowed to put it into some other project that not always you guys would approve.

**CHAIR SAVINO:** I agree. I understand what you’re saying. What we’re doing here is we’re setting a precedent. Bob?

**MR. BALDWIN:** Mr. Chair, this is recreational trails program money. It's not State sticker money and it's not an easy process to get it back and then reissue it again, so –

In the future, when you review grants, you will get a scope-item cost list and you need to review the scope items and see if that's a reasonable cost for them. If they're asking for \$500,000 and you can't justify that what they're going to do is going to cost that much; then obviously you wouldn't award \$500,000; or you'd make a stipulation when you approve the grant that any funds left over after the identified items were finished will be returned to the fund; and sum it up right then and there.

**CHAIR SAVINO:** That's not a bad idea there.

**MR. ROGERS:** Let's change the motion. Let's just change the motion to read, you know, we'll give them the extension date; but before she can expend the funds she has to run it by us.

**CHAIR SAVINO:** I don't know if we can. I understand what you're saying, Bob; and maybe we can write it in there and stuff like that for this project – but it's going to be hard for me. I'll give you an example. A project that was brought to us a few years back was gates on the Tonto, \$35,000 a gate. That's this. That's this.

**MR. ROGERS:** That's the one I threw a fit over.

**CHAIR SAVINO:** Right. That's this project. Okay? This very project at \$35,000 a gate.

**MR. BALDWIN:** If they only project \$20,000 and it cost them \$35,000 –

**MR. MOORE:** We have no mechanism for – if they – you know, to go over – if they run short. You don't want to have a project stalled on the ground 90 percent completed because they ran short. If you look at her numbers, it wasn't what he was describing. She didn't do 30 or 40 – the amount they spent didn't come in at 30 or 40 percent of what they asked for, it came in at 80 plus percent of what they asked for and they're trying to finish up the rest of it.

**MR. ROGERS:** Mr. Chair, you know this is a simple fix. Bob says we can do this. Let's give them the extension then she has to tell us what she's going to do with the money before she's allowed to spend any of the excess money.

**CHAIR SAVINO:** Okay. I'm going to change my – I'm going to resend my motion. I would like to make a motion to –

**MR. ROGERS:** Do we have to vote on that? We had a motion and a second.

**AAG HERNBRODE:** If both of you agree to modify the motion –

**MR. ROGERS:** I agree to modify it.

**CHAIR SAVINO:** Okay, I wanna modify the motion.

**MR. BALDWIN:** Well read it all the way through the "extend the project end date." Then when it says, "Expand upon future approval" –

**CHAIR SAVINO:** Okay. I move the Off-Highway Vehicle Advisory Group extend the project end date for the Tonto National Forest Mesa Ranger District Recreational Trails Program Motorized Project #470802 OHV Access-Control Development by 12 months to January 23, 2013 with – and this is where I put it in, correct? – with the stipulation that the project manager notifies State Parks on the exact locations and intent for this expansion. And that would – should I read the rest of it, then?

**MR. ROGERS:** I just think you need to simply state she has to have prior approval from OHVAG before monies are expended.

**CHAIR SAVINO:** Okay, do I have a second on that motion?

**AAG HERNBRODE:** For additional items.

**CHAIR SAVINO:** Right, for additional items.

**MR. ROGERS:** I second that.

**CHAIR SAVINO:** All right, it's been moved and seconded. No discuss. We already had it. I'm asking for a vote. All those in favor?

**CHORUS OF VOICES:** Aye.

**CHAIR SAVINO:** Okay, I have four ayes. It's passed. Okay? The next one. I can't go into the one that she had on the thing – how do I address that? It wasn't listed on her Sticker Fund so we can't even address that, can we?

**AAG HERNBRODE:** You'll have to address that at your next meeting.

**CHAIR SAVINO:** Yeah, yeah. Okay, so where do you –

**MR. BALDWIN:** John Brown are you on the line?

**MR. BROWN:** Yes, I am.

**MR. BALDWIN:** John Brown is representing the Kaibab National Forest. They're asking for a time extension for their signage project on the South Zone. Their letter is included there as item F-1(a). You want to make any presentation, John; or do you wanna just answer questions?

**MR. BROWN:** Why don't we just go ahead and answer questions.

**CHAIR SAVINO:** Okay. Any board members have any questions for this project?

**MR. MOORE:** Yes, John. What is the status of the thing and why is the extra time needed? Has there been a delay in either materials or labor or – what has been the issue that it wasn't able to be completed in the original time frame?

**MR. BROWN:** The biggest reason it wasn't able to be completed in the original time frame was the decision for the Tusayan District which was originally put out in April of 2009. It ended up being appealed and we ended up having to withdraw it in August of 2009, which required us to go back through the process again. So the new decision for that project wasn't available – wasn't made until – oh, let me get the right date for you here – wasn't made until January 31, 2011;

and we were not able to implement until September 30, 2011. So it ended up – well we thought we would be able to start in 2009, got delayed until 2011.

The Williams District also suffered a delay; but not nearly as much. Their's was only six months. So how that effected us – the original plan, the one we'd like to push forward with – if you will put the maps back-to-back on the same piece of paper; so when you got handed the map for the Tucson District you also had Williams District on the other side of it. So that was the big problem with this.

The other thing that had really come to light since the Williams District map went out in June 15, 2011 was the number of errors both on the ground – on the signing on the ground – and on the map itself. We are working very diligently to correct all those. So that's – it really has had an effect on what's going on. We initially only published a total of 8,000 maps for the two districts knowing that there would be errors. We were – or originally asked to be able to print 20,000 and the idea was that we knew the first maps – the first series of maps would have errors on it and the second series of maps would be a lot better.

**MR. ROGERS:** Question, John. Who appealed it?

**MR. BROWN:** We had two groups appeal it. One of them, of course, was the Center for Biological Diversity and the other was a private individual.

**CHAIR SAVINO:** That private individual, what was his appeal; what was his reasoning?

**MR. BROWN:** His reasoning for his appeal was that we were singling out hunters as a proponent that was going to get preferential treatment.

**CHAIR SAVINO:** Any other questions?

**MR. MOORE:** Do you expect to be able to for sure complete the project in this allotted amount of time and with the original funds that have been approved?

**MR. BROWN:** Yes. Yes we do. As I said we're working right now on updating the maps so that they'll be prepared to go to print early on in the coming year. We're hoping to get them in to them by the 1<sup>st</sup> of April so we can have them ready to go out on the street by the 1<sup>st</sup> of June.

**MR. MOORE:** Okay, I have one last question for you. Why did you feel it was necessary to go ahead and print 8,000 maps that you knew were going to have to be discarded and then redone instead of just postponing the whole thing and doing all 20,000 correctly the first time.

**MR. BROWN:** The answer is because we didn't know how many errors were on there. We thought we'd done a very good job. Once we put them into the hands of the public and the public has definitely located our mistakes and our shortcomings.

**MR. MOORE:** Okay.

**MR. ROGERS:** Any other opportunity for the Center to appeal this?



**MR. BROWN:** No, the decision's been made and we're all set now. It's been upheld and we're completely set to go. We're outta the weeds, as a matter of saying.

**CHAIR SAVINO:** Okay. Thomas or Pete, you have any questions?

[No verbal response.]

**CHAIR SAVINO:** Okay, then I move that the Off-Highway Vehicle Advisory Group extend the project end date for the Kaibab National Forest Recreational Trails Program Motorized Project #470805, South Zone Signage and Public Information by 12 months to January 23, 2013. Do I have a second?

**MR. MOORE:** Second.

**CHAIR SAVINO:** Seconded by Dave Moore. All those in favor, say aye.

**CHORUS OF VOICES:** Aye.

**CHAIR SAVINO:** Okay we have four ayes, the motion passed. Thank you very much – who is it, John? You got your extension.

**MR. BROWN:** Thank you very much. I surely appreciate it. I know the public will.

**MR. MOORE:** Send us some of those maps down here. We'd like to see them when you're done.

**MR. BALDWIN:** They'll be handing those maps out all over there won't they?

**MR. BROWN:** Definitely. We've gone through most of these and already are giving them out to people.

**CHAIR SAVINO:** Okay, thank you very much. Bob?

**MR. BALDWIN:** The third request is from the Coconino National Forest Red Rock Ranger District. Jodi Nickerson is here to represent that project. This was an OHV Rec Fund Project.

**MS. NICKERSON:** You guys mind if I hand some stuff out?

**CHAIR SAVINO:** I don't care what you do.

**MS. NICKERSON:** I've got a few handouts – sorry for those on the phone; but I will do my best to describe what I'm going over. It's just an overview of what's been going on thus far.

I guess almost a year ago – well, I guess, can I start? Permission to start?

**CHAIR SAVINO:** Yes, go ahead.

**MS. NICKERSON:** My name is Jodi Nickerson. I'm the OHV Program Coordinator for the Red Rock Ranger District on the Coconino. We have the Red Rock Grant that has several different aspects to it. We got it about a year ago. The time clock started in approximately May, I believe. Grant overview for what I – there are five different elements on there: education and enforcement, which is primarily

me and the things that I do. Road maintenance and reconstruction, inventory, re-closures of areas that have been closed and then re-opened via public and cultural clearances which is the archeologists going out there doing surveys and clearing an area so that work can be done on the ground. Specifically this is with the roads that are outfitter guides, the Jeeps in Sedona and that sort of thing; and the public OHVs that are used predominantly.

The handouts that I've given you, I'm not sure if you've seen these before. I just included the two quarterly reports that I have already submitted to Bob for the Grant. So the first one, April to June, it goes over my initial orientation and training; everything I did with education and enforcement – all the different committees that I've become a part of on the Coconino, including the Motorized Youth Coordination Committee which directly works with the implementation of our upcoming travel management rule; and establishing a rapport with the off-highway vehicle groups that we have in the Verde Valley and in Flagstaff, including the Coconino Trail Riders. I'd like to say that Robert Kline is here to support this as a trail rider; and also Bill Stafford is also here from the Montezuma Rim Rock McGuireville Trail Coalition. He is the president of the trails coalition, also in support of this extension and additional scoping.

So the two quarterly reports go through all the accomplishments as well as – I have included in there a document that I have made up, an assessment of needs. This has been presented to not only the Red Rock staff; but also the Coconino leadership team. So the Forest is aware of this document and supportive. It recognizes the Cornville single-track loop, which I will point out on this map. In my education and enforcement getting to know exactly what's going on on the ground, I've developed five different areas of primary use on the Red Rock District.

The Rim Rock area is right here. The Cornville single-track loop is right here; so those two areas – this data was given to me from a Coconino trail riders. All this – the stuff in blue was done by Bill Stafford's group, otherwise known as MRN Trails Coalition. They got started on their own inventory of this area. Then this red section right here is another single track that was given to me by another Coconino trail rider. So, that's what this map is. The blue indicates areas of use.

The original grant had the inventory for the Spellman Lake area. Instead of going out and immediately hiring someone to do work that – I wanted to make sure I knew what was out on the ground beforehand. So, in my talking to the public; in my own patrols at the Spellman Lake area I determined that the inventory was not needed in this area so it's – I'm touching on that – the inventory wasn't needed in this area; however, we would like to reallocate it.

Another thing we've got to mention about where things are at; road maintenance and reconstruction, that is going to be completed this month – yeah, we're in December. So that will be completed this month. Education enforcement continues. The inventory – I have had folks starting inventory in the area between Camp Verde and Rim Rock; so to complete this picture – and hopefully we are also going to be able to complete the picture in this area as well. So

that's the inventory that was done in 2005 from the Travel Management Rule – actually completed this. The reason we didn't know that is because we didn't have someone such as myself in this position, to totally put all their time to OHV.

That is why we realized the inventory wasn't needed there. It's actually needed elsewhere. The cultural clearances, the fifth aspect, due to the hiring freeze – I'm not sure if you were aware that the Forest Service has been under a hiring freeze due to the federal budget and various other things; and the amount of work the southwest archeologists have, we have not been able find an archeologist who is available and qualified to do the work until about a month ago. He starts Monday. That is one of the reasons we need the extension because we haven't been able to get those cultural clearances done to this point due to budget issues with the government.

Also, the other reason for extension is that we would like to add this additional scope item of scoping for trails in the Montezuma Rim Rock McGuireville area down to Camp Verde and over to Cornville, incorporating not only the trails that – the MRM Trails Coalition have inventoried, but also the priority trails that the Coconino Trail Riders have in that single track that is just southeast of Cornville.

**CHAIR SAVINO:** Okay, I have a question on that. There has been some comments made to me from the Coconino Trail Riders Association that they aren't satisfied with the TMR that you're putting out for the Coconino. They're seeking some litigation on that. Is this going to help along those lines?

**MS. NICKERSON:** This is going to totally help them. Thomas, you were at that meeting last month, I believe; and Robert was as well. I went. I go to Coconino Trail Riders meetings when my schedule allows and we discussed this trail. This trail was not known before I started in March by the Forest Service. It took me going to the meetings and talking to the trail riders and having them give me this data and this information. Also my relationship with the OHV businesses in Cottonwood – I actually have met the guy who built the trail.

This trail is not one of those that was under contention up in the Flagstaff area because of travel management. However, in my meetings with the Coconino Trail Riders, they have identified this as a priority for them because it provides them with winter riding opportunities fairly close to home. That's one of the reasons why I consider it a high priority for us. Not only is it the largest single track that we have on the Red Rock District, but it's also a huge priority for the Coconino Trail Riders. A lot of other people I know in Flagstaff who aren't part of the trail riders, ride their bikes and ride this trail in the snow.

**CHAIR SAVINO:** Thomas, I need your input on this. Have you discussed this with Warren and what do you guys think about it?

**MR. McARTHUR:** Yes. Well, the Cornville single track is real critical for us. We've put quite a bit of effort into getting that on the radar screen for Coconino and Judd he's helping us out with that. So we definitely need to get that in.

I'm not familiar with some of the other trails, but I understand that there are more over in the Rim Rock area. I don't know them and I would certainly like to see the map of trails expanded into that area.

**CHAIR SAVINO:** Now I'm going to ask you another question. Does this help and will this keep you from filing that complaint with the Blue Ribbon Coalition and getting them involved in this thing?

**MR. McARTHUR:** No.

**CHAIR SAVINO:** No, well then obviously there are some other issues; and maybe we – at this point maybe we can help on this thing; and is this the proper venue with Jodi?

**MR. McARTHUR:** I don't know that it is. I think what she is doing there in the Red Rock is great and it would very much help us find and keep the trails down there. I see that as basically not connected with the TMR. So much of the problem with the TMR is up in the – what is it, Jodi? The Flagstaff District?

**MS. NICKERSON:** Yes.

**MR. McARTHUR:** Where we've gone from 100 plus miles of single track that has been there for decades down to – in the TMR we have 20 miles or something. So as wonderful as the work that Jodi is doing down on the Red Rock, it doesn't have any impact with what the TMR has done up in Flagstaff.

**CHAIR SAVINO:** Okay I can't go into that because we didn't have that on our thing – am I doing good, Jodi – Joy?

**AAG HERNBRODE:** Sounds good!

**CHAIR SAVINO:** I just wanted to clarify it didn't have anything to do with that. Go on.

**MS. NICKERSON:** I just wanted to point out you have copies of all those maps I did hand out. The Montezuma Rim Rock, McGuireville Trails Coalition – they have been working on this – how many years, Bill?

**MR. STAFFORD:** Over two years.

**MS. NICKERSON:** Over two years. This community has gotten together a group of people who are interested in motorized and non-motorized trails; and the community needs it. Walking out to the Forest Service land, right out their backdoor, you see the use. I think the Forest Service would – not only do we have the public who is interested and wants to be involved, but we also have the wonderful opportunity that TMR or travel management rule is coming into play at the end of February, early March – about the time that our inventory will get done in this area so we can start this public scoping.

With travel management, everyone says it's a horrible thing and everyone is going to be upset; but I personally want the OHV community to be upset because then they will get involved. The more we can get them involved in the public scoping, the better our trail system in this area will be.

**CHAIR SAVINO:** That leads us to my next question which is kind of a moot point because I see you have an OHV representative sitting right there. He wouldn't be here unless he was in favor of it. We need – that's what – my biggest concern with this TMRs are is that we don't ignore the OHV community. That the OHV community wherever it is has input on these trail systems.

**MS. NICKERSON:** Absolutely. So every time – Bill and his group put on a National Trails Day on November 5. It was a wonderful event of Dutch-oven cooking of trying to pull the community out. I made a point of sending an email to every OHV contact I have made since March so that they'd be there. I definitely saw a few there; and then also in the public comments that we got from that one event due to Bill and his group's work, there is that interest of motorized trails.

The public has started it – the Forest – we have the backing. We just need the money.

**CHAIR SAVINO:** What was your group's name again?

**MR. STAFFORD:** It's the MRM Trails Coalition – Montezuma, Rim Rock, McGuireville.

**CHAIR SAVINO:** I noticed on that – I looked it up the other day on the webpage and I didn't –

**MS. HORNBODE:** We need to stick to the grants.

**CHAIR SAVINO:** It was mentioned in that. Are you a motorized group? Because I noticed on your website – this is in relation to your thing; because if you're getting the backing from this group – on your website it really didn't go into any motor – off-highway vehicle motorized stuff. It looked like I saw the Dutch-oven cooking and the whole nine yards; but for trails and stuff, do you have a segment of your group that's motorized?

**MR. STAFFORD:** Yes, multi-use. What our mission statement is – and I have some of my cards here.

**MR. BALDWIN:** Can you stand up and talk so we can get you on the mike there.

**CHAIR SAVINO:** Say your name again, please.

**MR. STAFFORD:** Bill Stafford, president Montezuma-Rim Rock. Our mission statement: "Montezuma-Rim Rock-McGuireville Trails Coalition creates and sustains a multi-purpose, communitywide trail system in the Beaver Creek Area." That's our official mission statement. We represent multiple users, horsemen, hikers, mountain bikers, ATVers. I am into Jeeps, that sort of thing.

We have inventoried approximately 139 miles of existing trails in our area; most of which are motorized. We have a lot of interest in our area in motorized use – ATV, specifically.

**CHAIR SAVINO:** How much – now a question back to you. How much money have the horsemen, hiking groups and bicycle groups put toward this TMI?

**MS. NICKERSON:** I couldn't give you that number even if it was the OHV community. I don't know how much money they have put in. But actually I can. The horsemen and all that sort of stuff, it doesn't influence them. I don't know what I was just thinking. Because travel management is motorized specific.

**CHAIR SAVINO:** Yes, but, just like with any other travel management rule, whether it be BLM or Forest Service, you ask for – when you give your public opinion, you ask for opinions from the Horsemen's Association, even the Indian tribes or what have you. I'm just curious, how much money are you receiving for the development of these trails from other organizations other than motorized trails.

**MR. ROGERS:** Mr. Chair, we've got to hurry this thing up. I've got a long ways to go after this.

**CHAIR SAVINO:** Well, Hank you –

**MR. ROGERS:** This is not even relevant to what she's doing here, John.

**CHAIR SAVINO:** Well, Hank, listen? Let me put it this way, Hank? If you want to take off, you can take off. We have a quorum; you can take off any time you want.

**MR. ROGERS:** I'm outta here, thank you. (2:05 pm)

**CHAIR SAVINO:** Okay.

**MR. MOORE:** I have a question on this. So my understanding is that the change of the scope is not changing what you're doing with the money; or how much money you're spending, but changing the area in which the study and everything is being done?

**MS. NICKERSON:** Not necessarily. I – the initial scope – or the initial inventory area of the Spellman Lake, we had a verbal okay to start inventorying another area on the district because it was the same essence inventory. So we have begun doing that. What we would like to add to the grant is the public scoping of the – actually getting a trail proposal.

So, we want to start the NEPA process – I know that's kind of a bad word in those places – but it has to be done. So what we're hoping for is to have this – the \$19,000 used for the scoping process which would include – I think it says in the letter – the public meetings, accumulation of data, et cetera, et cetera, and all that sort of thing. It will also include – because we can't – we have to make sure that the Forest Service is of course involved in this process. It does include some specialist time.

So, that is what that \$19,000 is for. We want a year for it because, 1) we have to finish the inventory so that we actually can show the public what's out there; and then we also – the travel management coming into play, all that sort of thing; getting people involved. Honestly, getting people upset so that they get involved. The longer our public comment period for the initial trail proposal is open the more likelihood we're going to get more people involved. The shorter the time, the less people and that's why we're going for a year extension.

**CHAIR SAVINO:** Okay, great!

**MR. MOORE:** Was this grant originally Sticker Fund money or RTP?

**CHAIR SAVINO:** Sticker Fund money. Pete, do you have any questions?

**MR. PFEIFER:** Well, I was just listening to her and I don't know if [inaudible] or not; but I was just kind of surprised that we'd be using Sticker Fund money to fund a NEPA. I thought the projects were supposed to be NEPA ready when we funded them. But maybe it's because they're branching out into a different area?

**CHAIR SAVINO:** I'd like to direct that question to Bob.

**MR. BALDWIN:** Mr. Chair and group; the statute allows you to allocate money for cultural and environmental surveys, which is part of the NEPA process. In the past you have indicated that you would do that in conjunction with a ready project that was going to end up with a result on the ground.

**CHAIR SAVINO:** Okay. Does that answer your question, Pete?

**MR. PFEIFER:** Yes, I think it does.

**CHAIR SAVINO:** Okay, Thomas, do you have any? This is your area. Do you have any questions?

**MR. McARTHUR:** No, I don't. I'm good. Thanks.

**CHAIR SAVINO:** Okay, without any more questions, I move the Off-Highway Vehicle Advisory Group extend the project end date for the Coconino National Forest Red Rock Ranger District Off-Highway Vehicle Recreation Fund Motorized Project #571016 Red Rock Ranger District OHV area improvements by 12 months to May 31, 2013; and add a new scope item to allow the District to begin the public outreach regarding a motorized, non-motorized trail system in the Verde Valley, thus, initiating the first phase – the first phase of the National Environmental Policy Act requirements using the cost savings of approximately \$19,000 from the original inventory scope item – do you get jollies by writing all this stuff down this way?

**MR. BALDWIN:** She's the one –

**CHAIR SAVINO:** It's her? Okay, is there a second to this?

**MR. PFEIFER:** Yeah, I'll second that.

**CHAIR SAVINO:** Okay, Pete seconded it. All those in favor?

**MR. PFEIFER:** Aye.

**CHAIR SAVINO:** That's one aye.

**MR. McARTHUR:** Aye.

**CHAIR SAVINO:** That's two ayes. That's three ayes. I was hoping you'd say aye. You responded to the thing, Thomas, since this is your area.

**MR. McARTHUR:** You betcha!

**MR. BALDWIN:** Do you vote aye?

**CHAIR SAVINO:** I don't have to vote if there are three ayes.

**MR. BALDWIN:** There's gotta be a quorum.

**CHAIR SAVINO:** Oh a quorum.

**AAG HERNBRODE:** He doesn't need to vote.

**CHAIR SAVINO:** I don't have to vote unless there's a tie.

**MR. BALDWIN:** The majority of the quorum.

**CHAIR SAVINO:** Okay, that's been passed. Thank you very much.

**MS. NICKERSON:** Thank you guys.

**CHAIR SAVINO:** Where do you wanna go now? Hang on guys.

Okay, I'm going to agenda item G: "Presentation of Statewide OHV Program Marketing Proposal."

- G. PRESENTATION OF STATEWIDE OHV PROGRAM MARKETING PROPOSAL -**  
**PRfect Media is on state contract to provide media and public relations for state agencies. A representative will present a proposal to provide a strategic plan for the OHV website enhancement. For more information regarding PRfect Media go to [www.prfectmedia.com](http://www.prfectmedia.com).**

**CHAIR SAVINO:** PRfect Media is on state contract to provide media and public relations for state agencies. A representative will present a proposal to provide a strategic plan for the OHV website enhancement. For more information – okay. Sir, go ahead. State your name.

**MR. MERRITT:** My name is Ron Merritt. I'm the Chief Operating Officer of PRfect Media, the company that will be doing the presentation to you today.

**MR. HERNANDEZ:** I'm John Hernandez; I'm the CEO of PRfect Media.

**MR. MERRITT:** What we have for you today is a PowerPoint presentation; and following the PowerPoint presentation we will be distributing hardcopy notebooks of the exact same presentation. For those of you joining us via phone we could probably email it to you shortly after this meeting. We can get that to Doris and have it emailed to you so that you have it in front of you.

**CHAIR SAVINO:** I'd like to have it also sent to the other members who aren't on the phone.

**MR. MERRITT:** Very good. I'll try to be as descriptive as possible with this PowerPoint presentation since we have two of the members actually via phone. So with that we'll go ahead and get into our presentation. I'll give you a little background and history about our company.

We were established in 1994. We have seven core service departments, including marketing, Hispanic marketing, advertising, public relations, media



placement, video production and graphic design. We are also a certified, minority owned company as the company is owned by John Hernandez.

To give you a little bit of background about what we have done in the past, we are a multi-award winning company. As I just mentioned, we are in our 17<sup>th</sup> about to be 18<sup>th</sup> year here in Arizona. We are a two-time, 2009 Telly Award Winner, we've also won the Addy Award for designing the quarter state portfolio, which the State of Arizona came out with. The portfolio was designed by our company. We're also a nine-time international Marcom Creative Award winner; and also a three-time international Creative Hermes Award winner.

Everybody wants to know who we represent. We have a heavy representation in government. We represent a significant number of, both current and in the past, state agencies. We currently work for the County. We've just been awarded a contract with the Maricopa Integrated Health System; we've done work for Nissan. Our accounts are literally all over the country with about 80 percent of our concentration here in the Phoenix metropolitan area. We are also very heavy into long-term care facilities. That happens to be another one of our expertise besides the government; so we do a significant amount of that work across the entire country as well.

Here's our primary presentation to the committee. Our strategy and implementation for this statewide OHV program exists of six primary issues and here they are: Number one is to engage in an educational awareness and public outreach program targeting media, the public, clubs and organizations. Item number two would be to rewrite and update the website. Bring in some additional research and purchase additional domain names that can be directed to the current website. In this area we would be concentrating very heavily into making the current website more user friendly and have more concentration of information for OHV across the entire state. Our third item would be to promote OHV using video production to promote opportunities, perhaps the development of safety video and/or promotional and training videos to kind of inspire and produce additional interests in OHV across the entire state; and for those individuals who are wanting to get into it for the first time.

Our fourth item would be to promote clubs and organizations using electronic newsletters and e-blasts. When we say promote, we mean cross educate events that may be going on across the entire state and basically bonding the clubs and organizations together in a more cohesive program. Item number five would be to establish a statewide partnership to increase communications and education, not only to the general public about OHV, but throughout the clubs and organizations as a whole; and our sixth one is to develop and engage a viral marketing program.

As we take a look at specifically what our program would involve, it is website enhancement, advance information and training videos, electronic web magazine, e-blasts throughout the timeframe, collateral material development electronically used for downloading from the website, and media relations; also opportunities as far as the amount of events going on across the entire state.

Now we're going to talk a little bit about these individually. We'll start with the website enhancements. Our primary emphasis here would be to take the existing website that is on the State Parks and coordinate with your internal people to update information, add new videos to it – event videos, training videos, et cetera; and also increase communications for the OHV community throughout the entire valley – or throughout the entire state.

We would also research, purchase and secure additional domain names beneficial to OHV. So we anticipate that website enhancement will take a good chunk of the time – at least for the first several months. The second item would be video productions. Here we would want to introduce the production of information and training videos in the OHV community. Here we would write, shoot, and edit all of our videos as we have in-house, high definition video production that is all part of the services we provide.

In this particular case, we would want some direction from not only the committee; but obviously want to take some direction from the State Parks Department with regard to types of videos we would produce for you. There would be no limit to the number of videos we would produce for you. We would also like to go out to specific events across the entire state and videotape some of those events, as well. So that, too, would be part of the entire video production scenario.

The next one is an electronic web magazine. We are recommending the development of a monthly, electronic e-magazine as we call it. PRfect Media would create it, write it, design it, lay it out and distribute it for you on a month-to-month basis. We would work with you – meaning not only the committee; but also the various clubs and organizations throughout the state to obtain content and photos. We would have a list of all the events going on throughout the clubs and organizations just to inform the OHV community where those events are taking place. So this is something that we do. We produce an electronic web magazine for almost every one of our clients. We currently produce more than 17 of them per month. They average between one and three pages in length – depending upon what they are. We also want to take this magazine and upload it to the website as well as distribute it directly to clubs and organizations.

Now, one of the things that we would do as an organization to assist in the binding of the clubs and organizations is we would actually go out and solicit emails from the various clubs and organizations throughout the entire state; and put them into one cohesive mailing list – e-mailing list.

**[End of tape.]**

**MR. MERRITT:** . . . to actually develop and spend money on print collateral materials. However, based upon what we saw on the website what we would like to do is take some of the existing collateral materials and re-design it and also put some – re-design it so it's a little bit easier to follow, and more user friendly; and upload it – re-upload it to the website.

We would be looking at the electronic brochures, electronic newsletters, e-blasts of course – e-blasts would be used primarily for event promotion – event opportunities and also viral marketing using video, email, Facebook and Twitter.

The next item is the media relations. Here is something we believe the OHV community as a whole could really use a significant amount of increase in. We would like to pitch OHV-related stories to all statewide media. Conceptualize, write and monitor the dissemination of all information. We would be targeting obviously the print and online magazines that are very relevant to this area; we would also want to cover and increase OHV recognition – recognition throughout the entire state – by using local community newspapers; and also television statewide when the opportunity presents itself and it is appropriate to do so. So, media relations are something we will look at very heavily and want to use in cooperation with this committee; and also the State Parks Department.

Under public relations, we would be looking at doing media coverage on a statewide basis with a heavier concentration in print than any other area and of course, the local trade and business association newsletters. But print seems to be more of the type of story they would be willing to cover for OHV. So we'd have a very heavy concentration of print in all the newspapers throughout the entire state.

As we move on, looking at events and opportunities in this area, we would promote OHV events and opportunities from clubs and organizations. In essence, what we would be doing here is just informing the general public and the other organizations throughout the entire state of the events coming up. We would not be directly promoting the events, it would be from an informational standpoint only. Okay?

Some social media – we looked at viral marketing and there is a significant amount of stuff that can be done in the viral marketing. However, I will tell you the primary emphasis of the reason why we're recommending this to you is because we can use viral marketing to drive additional traffic to the website; and that is exactly what we would be doing. All of the videos that we will be producing – training videos, informational videos, event videos, whatever it happens to be – are all going to go on YouTube. You will have your own YouTube Channel.

We're going to be looking at Twittering out any type of events coming out throughout the entire state – again, informational purposes only. So as we look at viral marketing, there are over 400 platforms in viral marketing across the United States today. We would probably be using only about three or four of them here locally throughout the entire state. And that would be primarily the YouTube, the Twitter, Facebook and perhaps one or two others as well.

As we take a look at our implementation and timeline, we wanted to give you a rough idea of what we would do over a 12-month period of time, but focusing on the first three months in particular. We are very big on producing what we call a return on your investment and being very specific on what you're going to

receive in the allotted timeline. So in our first 30 days we would develop key messaging, primarily for the website. We would also contact all HOV clubs and organizations. We are aware there are several of them currently on the website. Frankly, we have found several more that are already – we have found already several more that are not currently on your website; and the website does need a significant update in that particular area – with regards to the clubs and organizations available across the state.

We would develop the email and marketing lists throughout the entire state and identify OHV events for the entire year, meaning the calendar year of 2012. Also in the first 30 days we would research and secure all additional domain names on behalf of the State Parks Department.

In the second 30 days – as we take a look at the 60-day period – we would be updating the website. We'd be full into updating the website by this time. It will not be complete within 60 days. There is a significant amount of work we need to do. But we would be well underway into the 60-day period of updating the website. We'd also be writing text for the collateral materials, basically re-designing and re-writing some of the current collateral materials that are on the website. We would also design and do all the layout for them; and we would begin writing – we're going to call it a marketing video, but in actuality it's going to be the very first video that we would do for OHV overall in whatever capacity that happens to be.

As we get into the third month of this campaign, we would design the new web magazine template, we would also design the new e-blast template. We would approve the first video that we will be producing for you and begin shooting that first video, as well as approve the web magazine and the e-blast templates; and write and distribute the very first web magazine across the entire state by the end of the 90-day period.

So, as you can see, in the first 90 days we actually upload an awful lot of the development phases of this statewide campaign. So by the time we finish the first 90 days we are well on our way to getting to where we need to be in order to continue the promotions for the remaining nine months.

That pretty much looks at what we're recommending to the entire – to the committee as a whole. Now as we take a look at what our compensation would be, we are under contract with the State of Arizona. We are a general marketing partner with the State of Arizona under the contract. I don't have the contract number on me. It's EPF something. We are required to provide all of our services at \$75 per hour. That is a flat-rate fee. It doesn't matter if we're doing public relations or video productions, it makes no difference. All of our services are all at the same fee.

What we are anticipating is about 53 hours per month at about \$4,000 per month for this entire one-year project. It literally includes all these items we're about to list up for you. All website enhancements: we would research and purchase the domain names for a period of two years. All media relations, all event

information and training videos [unlimited numbers]; the electronic magazines, web magazines on a monthly basis, e-blasts on an on-going basis; electronic collateral material – writing, development and layout; all viral marketing, all events and opportunities – that would also include us traveling, statewide, for an annual maximum of ten events across the entire state. That would be at the discretion of the committee as to how and where you would like those events to be promoted, or what type events you would want us to participate in; but we would actually travel to ten different locations throughout the entire state at your discretion and at your leisure.

So that, ladies and gentlemen is our proposal to the council. We are now ready to entertain any questions you may have while we distribute the notebooks to those individuals here in the room.

**CHAIR SAVINO:** Okay, I have a couple. My name is John Savino. I'm the chairman.

**MR. MERRITT:** Yes sir.

**CHAIR SAVINO:** A couple questions and a statement to start with.

One of the reasons we wanted this program – we felt a need for it – is that we want a one-stop shopping venue for the people. There's a lot of confusion out there in the OHV community about the Sticker Fund Program, where to get the thing – State Parks does have a lot of information on there and they have a good website with that information on there; but the majority of the people don't know that State Parks has that – to go to that, to look for that. They don't know. I didn't know before I got involved with OHVAG. So there was none of that.

When people come from California State Parks – you can't even think about taking your OHV into the state parks over there; so, in their minds State Parks doesn't exist for OHV use. In this state it does. We wanted some way for those people to come to say, "Hey, here we go." I envision something to have – and you may laugh at this, but have a billboard at the entrance of the state on I-10 coming into the state to say, "For OHV information go to such and such website." Then they go and then this just all opens up.

Everything that you do – this is really, really impressive – I really like that. I'd like to incorporate something like that – along those lines – to where we have that avenue. The state has hundreds of thousands of snowbirds come in and the good majority of them have OHVs now – ATVs and what have you. They don't know. There's a misconception out there on where all the Sticker Fund money goes. I have comments here and newsletter where people from Idaho say, "I'd be happy to buy a sticker – a decal for the State if I knew where the money was going." It's just going to the federal government or whatever. We need that way to get that out there to, "Hey, this is going to good causes – going back into trail development."

So that's what we want to do, develop that, to get it across to the people.

**MR. MERRITT:** Well, there are a couple ways of doing that, actually, not only with the billboard idea you just made reference to; but we can concentrate some of our media relations over into Southern California as an informational process for people – we have the ability to do media relations anywhere in the United States.

So, we could concentrate some of our media relations programs over into publications in Southern California in order to develop stories like that, that would inform travelers from California, or New Mexico, or wherever – other states – they’re coming from into Arizona about the OHV Program: “Bring your Off-Highway Vehicle. Go to our website. You’ve got all kinds of opportunities and you can have a wonderful time here in Arizona during your visit.”

**CHAIR SAVINO:** That’s the whole thing. We want to get across to the public that Arizona is an OHV-friendly state.

I have a question for Bob. Bob, when we awarded – approved \$50,000 – is that for one year? Was that a one-year thing, the \$50,000?

**MR. BALDWIN:** Correct.

**CHAIR SAVINO:** Okay, so that would fit into your – this \$48,000 for your program here?

**MR. MERRITT:** Yes, sir.

**CHAIR SAVINO:** So that would fit into the thing. Then each year would it be – because there are definitely start-up costs for you to go on there. Next year will you be coming back with \$48,000 as your cost?

**MR. HERNANDEZ:** I was going to say, normally what we do – this is John Hernandez with PRfect Media. As you see there’s a lot of design and development as we go along. Once we do that, the templates are already designed. Then it becomes more like a maintenance-kind of a deal. So, we don’t anticipate that it will be \$48,000 for year two. We’ll see what kind of work needs to be done. Perhaps there will be additional opportunities for us to get involved, you know, obviously the travel is a big chunk of it; and we’re including it in our costs here.

So, without really getting into the program and working it through; you know, say by month 9/10 we’ll know what we’re going to be needing for year two.

**CHAIR SAVINO:** Okay, so you’ll come to us with that estimate and then we can go from there.

**MR. BALDWIN:** You can include it as part of your recommendation to the Parks Board.

**CHAIR SAVINO:** All right. Do we have – Pete, do you have any questions?

**MR. PFEIFER:** I’m just curious, do these guys ride at all? Do they have riding experience on quads or ATVs or anything?

**MR. MERRITT:** I'm a quad rider. This is Ron. I'm a quad rider. Most of my riding is actually done up where my family is at. My parents and my brothers all live up in Winslow so I ride an awful lot through Navaho County.

**MR. PFEIFER:** Okay, great.

**MR. MERRITT:** So I'm very familiar with the industry as a whole and OHV and I've been doing it for years.

**CHAIR SAVINO:** That was one of our concerns when we first got into that. We didn't just wanna have some computer geek sitting there just doing this and we'd have to explain everything to him. We wanted someone who is savvy with the OHV industry.

Thomas, do you have any questions?

**MR. McARTHUR:** Nope, sounds good to me.

**CHAIR SAVINO:** David?

**MR. MOORE:** No.

**CHAIR SAVINO:** You're okay with it? Okay.

Now, is this a – we've already awarded the money – go ahead, Doris. Doris has a question or a comment.

**MS. PULSIFER:** I don't have a question, but our web and public information people are here?

**CHAIR SAVINO:** They have some questions? Great! Go for it! Which one first?

**MR. BALDWIN:** Please identify yourself for the record.

**MR. FARRELL:** I can't speak any louder. (Tye Farrell, State Parks Webmaster)

**MR. BALDWIN:** Then get closer to the microphone.

**MR. FARRELL:** Okay. I took some notes while you were going through the campaign and some of the things I noticed – you said, "unlimited" videos. Now videos, you're talking only about – working about 15 hours a week.

**MR. MERRITT:** When we say unlimited videos what we're talking about is we're not going to limit the number of videos you can have throughout the year. So in other words, up to that 53 hours per month which is over 600 hours in a year's period of time, however many videos we can produce for you within that period or how much of that time you want to allocate to video production is not a problem.

**MR. FARRELL:** So can the campaign be written so that the time that's spent on the different components of the different tactics you have in your strategy plan – the different tactics can be assigned the amount of hours?

**MR. MERRITT:** Absolutely!

**MS. BILBREY:** You know, media relations are already being done by me and by Game and Fish. So we have two PIOs that deal with the media on this every single day. (Ellen Bilbrey, State Parks PIO)

**MR. MERRITT:** Perfect!

**MS. BILBREY:** So there may be some ways we can cut that down and save the OHV community some time by just coordinating what you're doing. Because you don't need to pay – they don't need to pay for that again.

So if we can get more informational materials put together that we can use to put out – we have all our media lists and everything in there, Southern California, too – I work with Sunset.

**MR. MERRITT:** Perfect!

**MS. BILBREY:** So I think there are some ways to do that. The other thing is, do you bill – how do you send your bills? Are they by 15 minutes?

**MR. MERRITT:** Yeah, bills are sent – we use a program called Timeslips, which is a pretty standard program within our industry. We do bill in 15-minute increments; and what we would do is we would send a complete, detailed invoice every month. Even if we go over hours it's not going to increase the bill any. It's going to be a flat \$4,000 a month. That never changes, even if we go over in hours – which we will in the first three to four months as we constantly have to upload time in order to produce some of the initial collaterals.

**MS. BILBREY:** You're gonna go over.

**MR. MERRITT:** We will go over.

**MS. BILBREY:** Based on what you have here, yeah.

**MR. MERRITT:** We know that. We're aware of that. But we also know that over a year's period of time we will go over in the front half and then we will not go over in the back – in the back three months or so. So it balances itself out.

Usually we are very accurate, plus or minus five percent, every year – within time.

**MS. BILBREY:** Within time?

**MR. MERRITT:** Uhm hum.

**MS. BILBREY:** Okay. There was one other question that I had about your campaign. Are you going to provide the Off-Highway Vehicle Group and the State Parks a strategic plan?

**MR. MERRITT:** Yes.

**MS. BILBREY:** So, if you are awarded this you will prepare the complete strategic plan.

**MR. MERRITT:** Yes.



**MR. HERNANDEZ:** There will be a discovery phase. The first 30 days is usually where we find out exactly. That's where we get the key messaging and then we can map out that plan. Likely it's shown on the presentation as the 30/60/90 Plan of Action. That's what we'll do. We map out the entire year, but then, we eat the big elephant in small pieces. So we break that into a 90-day plan. We'll go quarter, by quarter, by quarter; and work the strategies thoroughly that way.

**MS. BILBREY:** Okay.

**MR. MERRITT:** And the Committee or State Parks can reallocate our time in any what they see fit as we go from quarter to quarter to quarter. The whole idea of going quarter to quarter is to get the specific deliverables done within that period of time.

**MS. BILBREY:** Right, that's what I'm kinda curious about. Because there were about 20 different items and I was trying to figure out how you're going to –

**MR. MERRITT:** Well we won't get it all done in 90 days.

[Laughter.]

**MS. BILBREY:** Yeah, you've got a lot of stuff. I just wanna be sure I understand. Oh, I know what the other question was: when you design, what programs do you use for designing your website? I might have some input on this; because if we're going to marry it into our, it needs to blend easily; and it has to be something that can be updated easily.

**MR. MERRITT:** What we are going to do is we're going to – it doesn't matter what program you're using because we have those programs available.

**MR. HERNANDEZ:** Yeah, we're using CS-5 for the design stuff. When it comes to – we normally do it with a lot of our clients because we do everything except the HTML, the coding and that kind of stuff. So we can design it. We wanna make sure the colors translate correctly – do those types of things.

So, the programs are whatever you need – whatever format you need them in. Even the video – if you need the video encoded in a certain manner, we can take care of that.

**MR. MERRITT:** We can encode them in anything you need embedded. As far as the – anything we re-do on the website such as the electronic brochures, anything of that nature, they're all PDFs; we just produce a PDF for you, send it over and it just gets uploaded. Very simplistic.

**MS. BILBREY:** Right. And you understand, dealing with government – you said you work with Maricopa County and I was kind of interested, which agency within Maricopa County?

**MR. MERRITT:** We work for the Treasurer's Office. We also just got a contract with the County Hospital – which we just talked about. We have various – we've had various contracts with different state departments throughout the past several years. So we're very, very familiar with government.

**MS. BILBREY:** We have so many restrictions.

**MR. MERRITT:** We're aware. We're not aware of them as much as she is; but we're probably aware of 80 percent of those restrictions. We're aware that we cannot promote specific events – promote using public money. We're well aware of all those types of restrictions. We've been down this road before and we understand.

**MS. BILBREY:** It makes it lot more difficult than when you're doing a private client.

**MR. MERRITT:** Understood! We know that. We know that.

**MS. BILBREY:** Okay. And will all the primaries be working on the account? Or will it be staff at \$35 or how would you –

**MR. MERRITT:** You're going to have a series of people who will actually be providing the services that you saw on the screen there. We will be assigning one primary account executive who will be responsible for the day-to-day communications with the Parks Department; and also the committee itself.

**MS. BILBREY:** But what I'm saying is, will it be a principal?

**MR. MERRITT:** Yes. You will have a principal, actually. I oversee the entire company – every single account comes through me.

**MS. BILBREY:** Okay, that's what I'm saying.

**MR. MERRITT:** Now, you won't have contact with me on a day-to-day basis; I mean, there are just too many for that to happen.

**CHAIR SAVINO:** If he oversees everything, what do you do?

**MR. HERNANDEZ:** I play golf!

[Laughter.]

**MR. HERNANDEZ:** No, the way our company's formatted, he's the CO; he's in charge of the daily operations. I work on brand development for ourselves, business development for ourselves, company strategies, things of that nature.

**MS. BILBREY:** What I was looking for is – are they using interns or entry-level PR people.

**MR. MERRITT:** We do not use interns, we do not have interns. In fact, you don't work for our company unless you have a minimum of five years' experience in public relations.

**MS. BILBREY:** Okay, that's exactly what I need.

**CHAIR SAVINO:** Okay, I'm going to elaborate on what you're saying because that does bring up a thing. Everybody who is working on this project will be OHV savvy?

**MR. MERRITT:** That's fine. That is fine.

**CHAIR SAVINO:** We need that input or have – you know, I don’t care – they can say that, but I wanted it to go through you or somebody who is OHV savvy.

**MR. MERRITT:** That is not a problem and I will tell you, none of the work comes out of our agency without my personally looking at it anyway. That’s my job as the chief operating officer to see to it that the quality of the work coming out of our agency, regardless of which of our employees is working on it, maintains the certain level that we require.

**CHAIR SAVINO:** You have any more questions on this?

**MR. FARRELL:** I just want to ask about the social marketing part. The social marketing part of it you’ve talked about – of course, you talked about 400 platforms – but you’re only going to be using two or three platforms, right?

**MR. MERRITT:** Two or three, primarily. Just as I mentioned in the presentation, what we’re looking at doing here for social media is going to be really just two prongs. Number one, increasing the SEO to the website and to that – to the OHV or the website itself; and number two, using it primarily to inform the OHV community statewide of events coming up, or maybe perhaps some legislation they need to be aware of, or whatever that particular topic needs to be.

So those are going to be the two primary uses of social media. We’re not going to Tweet for the sake of it.

**MR. FARRELL:** That’s what I was very, very afraid of.

**MR. MERRITT:** We don’t believe in that. Yeah, we don’t do that.

**MR. HERNANDEZ:** We don’t have time to do that.

**MR. MERRITT:** We don’t have time to do that and you don’t want to waste your money doing that.

**MS. BILBREY:** A lot of money can be wasted in those components if it’s not managed real tight.

**MR. MERRITT:** And that’s why –

**MS. BILBREY:** I don’t know – do you use TootSuite?

**MR. HERNANDEZ:** We can. We have the capabilities of it. Our account executives are – they’ve gone through social media training.

**MS. BILBREY:** Then you don’t have a problem with a Tweet going out that isn’t appropriate. I don’t know if you saw Jason Rose just got fired because he sent one Tweet and he lost the Special Olympics account – one error.

**MR. MERRITT:** That’s right.

**MS. BILBREY:** In government, we can’t have that kind of – when we have legislation –

**MR. MERRITT:** No, of course not! You also have to know that we are required to have our approvals in writing. So, we’re not Tweeting anything, we’re not

sending out any media, we're not doing anything until we have it approved in writing.

**MR. FERRAL:** Tye Farrell, research and marketing. I just have a couple comments. Would you guys be working for the OHVAG Committee or the Arizona State Parks? And then the follow up to that, who is the ownership of the video copywrite, if it's work for hire?

**MR. MERRITT:** Under our state contract, the state has the ownership – period! And that's really how it all boils down to. If you check pages 37 through 42, they will discuss ownership of all of our – of anything that we do on behalf of any state agency becomes the exclusive property of the state in perpetuity.

**CHAIR SAVINO:** I'd the answer to that other one – who they're working for. We work for State Parks. Like it or not, we work for State Parks; and so in a sense, they are working for State Parks. What we want – since we are the advisory group for the money – the funding and we came up with the ideas – we want input on it.

So, they'll be dealing with State Parks. They won't have to round up each one of us. It's just that we want the input on this – on the –

**MS. BILBREY:** It's got to be very clear that Doris and Bob are in control.

**MR. BALDWIN:** We will be administering the contract. We will – depending on the type of content and what the project is – consult with you and Tye.

**MR. FERRAL:** A couple other things. With the mailing list and the e-newsletter – this is something we do monthly for our agency – we don't have a full-time OHV employee anymore Bob. It's only part time and works on other things as well, so we don't do a specific newsletter; but I love the idea. I think you have some great goals, but how are you going to maintain the integrity of that list if you just ask all the OHV people to give you their list; because we maintain a double-opt-in policy for our current newsletter. Without starting a new list, I just have concerns – how are you going to gather that list for it to be effective; and then, at the end of the contract, again, who would have ownership of that list?

**CHAIR SAVINO:** If I may address that; yes, they don't have the full-time OHV coordinator anymore. Bob's wearing four hats. Okay? That where we want to take a more active role as OHVAG in that process of the thing. This would all be for naught if we had that OHV coordinator on board and all that stuff, but we don't. Times have changed. But we wanna do a OHVAG. We will have that input with that and if they need to reach out to the different clubs, that's where we can help out with that.

We represent a vast array of the different, you know, things. We have the OHV – or the Arizona Off-Highway Vehicle Coalition we can contact to get that information. So there are ways that we can do it, but through them to us.

**MR. MERRITT:** We're going to ask for obviously some initial help with the current contacts that are in place – obviously. As far as the email list itself is concerned,

you guys are going to have it every month because we're going to keep it updated on a monthly basis.

Now, when we send out electronic newsletters, they are sent out on a database using a third party called "Fire Drum," because you have to be very careful over spending laws. You're not allowed to send out any more than 49 pieces at any one time. So as a result of that, we have to use a third party so that we are not spamming. That third party allows us to give you vital reports on who opens the newsletter, who's reading your email, who's looking, who clicked through to your website – all of this data is available to you every time we send out that newsletter or that e-blast or whatever that particular component is.

So, everything is very, very organized and if we have a bounce-back believe me we know about it immediately.

**MR. FERRAL:** Then my only other comment is, you know, if it was not working we re-designed this OHV site when we did have a full-time person, we still have tried to maintain it. We think we have a lot of great informational downloads.

**MR. MERRITT:** You do!

**MR. FERRAL:** We are number one in Google for Arizona off-highway vehicles. You brought up some issues that some of the clubs are out of date. Without a person coordinating that, the materials – the atrophy happens.

**CHAIR SAVINO:** That's why we got to the point where we're at; and why we acknowledged that and why we decided to put out that \$50,000 is because of the times – economic times and the lack of support from staff.

**MR. FERRAL:** Sir, no! I just hope we can coordinate the logistics of how they're going to work with your committee's allotted people, these allotted – Ami Raki and I have worked, you know, for months straight – 80 hours – to get what we have. So it's just maintaining it. Fifty-three hours to me seems kind of on the low end.

**CHAIR SAVINO:** Well, speaking from OHVAG's end of it, I hope that we – we're invited – myself or whoever is available to come in to have input when we're setting this thing up because we want to have that input on it so we can get it right the first time.

**MS. BILBREY:** Yeah, we'll have a lot of duplications and a lot of problems if we don't coordinate. All the tactics that they've talked about we do already. There's nothing different from what we do already. It's just that they're going to do specifically toward the off-highway vehicle program. Then we have to be sure that Game and Fish – we have to coordinate all the tactics they're talking about – they're also doing. If they're making videos, those videos need to be already incorporated; or if NOHVCC is making videos, we need to use those training videos, not create new training videos.

**CHAIR SAVINO:** Right. Our original concept of this thing was to hire an intern position – intern position with State Parks – to have a person on staff to do this. Well, I like this idea to outsource to an outside company and get that.

**MS. BILBREY:** An intern couldn't do this work.

**CHAIR SAVINO:** Right – well, that's why we did it. That makes sense. Okay. All right. Do you have any more questions? You okay?

**MS. BILBREY:** Nope, we're good.

**CHAIR SAVINO:** State Parks, do you have any?

[No verbal response.]

**CHAIR SAVINO:** Okay. This doesn't call for a motion. I want to ask first, do we have any more discussion among the OHVAG members?

[No verbal response.]

**CHAIR SAVINO:** Do we have any OHVAG members left?

**MR. PFEIFER:** Yeah, I'm still here, John.

**CHAIR SAVINO:** Okay, good. I just wanted to make sure. All it's going to take – I'm not going to entertain a motion or anything I just want a yea or nay. Should we go and direct State Parks to enter into a contract with PRfect Advertising, Marketing and Video? I've got a good memory.

**AAG HERNBRODE:** Mr. Chairman?

**CHAIR SAVINO:** Yes.

**AAG HERNBRODE:** This is not an agenda item – not an action item and that would be actually a vote. So, you're good. Please don't vote.

**CHAIR SAVINO:** Don't vote?

**AAG HERNBRODE:** Don't vote.

**CHAIR SAVINO:** How do we give our blessing?

**AAG HERNBRODE:** You don't need to. It's already done. You've blessed it.

**CHAIR SAVINO:** Then why are you guys here?

**MR. MERRITT:** We were asked to present.

**MS. HRONBRODE:** To make sure you were happy with it.

**CHAIR SAVINO:** Okay, we're happy with it.

**MR. MERRITT:** Okay, all right.

**CHAIR SAVINO:** Thank you very much, and I look forward – here's a card.

**MR. MERRITT:** Let me get you a couple of our cards, too.

**CHAIR SAVINO:** What I'm going to do to speed things up, David needs to leave real quick and that will put us in a position where we won't have a quorum; so I need to get that done. So I'm going to ask Jeff, is it going to be a big imposition on you – I know you were here for the talking about the private thing – is it going to be a big imposition to have you come back?

**MR. GURSH:** Oh, I'll come back.

**CHAIR SAVINO:** I'd really appreciate it so we can get this thing; because we're going to lose him in a few minutes. I like you here every time because I like your input.

#### **F. OHVAG ACTION ITEMS**

1. **OHVAG Will Review and Approve the 2012 OHV Ambassador Program Expansion Grant Manual. – The Group will review and approve the criteria for eligibility to apply for this grant and the criteria for evaluating the applications. The solicitation for program coordinators will be announced in early December.** **TABLED**

**CHAIR SAVINO:** What we're going to do is we're going to table agenda item number three. We've already talked about that, the Ambassador Program – the Ambassador Program Expansion Grant Manual, we're tabling that until the next meeting. We already did the presentation of the marketing. We're going to go into reports.

#### **H. REPORTS – may be attached or presented verbally or the information may be provided at the meeting and will address the following subjects:**

1. **OHV Program Partner Reports:**

**NONE SCHEDULED**

2. **Staff Reports:**

- a. **Update on 2012 revenue in the Off-Highway Vehicle Recreation Fund and the amount available for projects.**

**CHAIR SAVINO:** Let me look through this. Can we table that item A on staff reports?

**MR. BALDWIN:** Which one?

**CHAIR SAVINO:** Item A.

**MR. BALDWIN:** H, 2(a)? I provided that information to you.

**MR. McARTHUR:** Yes, we have.

**CHAIR SAVINO:** I just have one question on it. Can we bring it up next time?

**MR. BALDWIN:** It's on the agenda every time.

- b. **Update on the Parks Board Action at their November 30, 2011 meeting regarding the evaluation of Boards, Commissions, and Advisory Committees.**

**CHAIR SAVINO:** Okay, good. The update on Parks Board Action. I can table that – can we table that? We knew we got passed, right?

**MR. BALDWIN:** Well, we haven't seen that yet – the official action from the Parks Board yesterday; but you got notice from the –

**CHAIR SAVINO:** I got assurance from the Board that we did.

**MR. MOORE:** What was the specific item?

**CHAIR SAVINO:** What they did on B, "Update on the Parks Board Action at their November 30 meeting" the other day – yesterday – meeting regarding the evaluation – we had that evaluation form – the results of that. Basically they recommended that all advisory group committees get forwarded.

**MR. MOORE:** And that was the only action that affected OHVAG?

**CHAIR SAVINO:** Yeah, right. That's the only thing that affected them and they told me about that.

**c. Update on Availability of Sticker Fund OHV Grant Program Funding Directly to Non-Profit Organizations to do OHV projects.**

**CHAIR SAVINO:** Okay, so, we don't have to worry about that.

"Update on Availability of Sticker Fund OHV Grant Program Funding Directly to Non-Profit Organizations Due to OHV Projects." That's the one that Jeff Gursh is talking about. I've asked Jeff to come back next time. We'll table it to the next meeting. Is that okay?

**MR. BALDWIN:** That will be part of your discussion on the grant criteria in the grant manual.

**d. Update on the International Trails Symposium to be held in Phoenix in April 2013. The Program Committee will be seeking participation from the Group in developing the motorized portion of the program curriculum.**

**CHAIR SAVINO:** Okay. We definitely – okay, "Update on the International Trail Symposium" who's here to do that?

**MR. BALDWIN:** Well, Ellen was here, but typically that's just to let you know that it is scheduled for April of 2013 and it is going to include motorized activities and events.

**CHAIR SAVINO:** Right and I got her in contact with Bill Nash.

**MR. BALDWIN:** Right. The convention is at the Fort McDowell Radisson Resort out there. I think it's the 17<sup>th</sup> of April. But over the next – basically in July they're going to start forming the actual program and what type program you want to present for OHV, you know.

**CHAIR SAVINO:** I've been involved in that.

**MR. MOORE:** Are we allowed to be an exhibitor there?

**CHAIR SAVINO:** I've been involved in that in the planning stage, a little bit. What I did was I also got them in contact with Bill Nash as far as the exhibits for the OHV community.



**MR. BALDWIN:** They have a member of the American Trails – a member of their Advisory Board or Board of Directors – is a member of NOVAC. So, they're not – they're knowledgeable of OHV. And she's said that they've attempted to do this in the past they just haven't had maybe the facility or the involvement of the motorized community. So that is what they're saying now, they are going to make it motorized; we do need the involvement of the community and that's going to be you guys, the dealers, and everybody that's involved.

**CHAIR SAVINO:** We talked about rides and what have you, so we need to get on board with that.

### **3. Chairman's Report:**

**a. The Chairman will report on a meeting held on November 16, 2011 between OHVAG Chairman, John Savino; OHVAG member, Hank Rogers; Parks Board Chair, Tracey Westerhausen; Director of State Parks, Renee Bahl, and Assistant Director of State Parks, Jay Ziemann.**

**CHAIR SAVINO:** Okay, does that cover all that stuff? Bob, do you have any other stuff that you know is pertinent that we need to take care of?

**MR. BALDWIN:** That's all the agenda items.

### **I. TIME AND PLACE OF NEXT MEETINGS AND CALL FOR FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS**

**CHAIR SAVINO:** Okay. The other thing I've given him – I'm giving him a list right now, guys. He can put it out and we can go from there on meetings for next year. Okay?

**CHAIR SAVINO:** What I tried to do was take into consideration David's needs for the – you know, I kind of know when your races are. I have the meeting's set for February 10, May 18, August 17, November 2. So I got those dates down. I'm going to give this to Bob with May 18<sup>th</sup> being our field trip and we're going to go to Kingman.

Now I'd like to make this statement that these dates when we get them on there, unless it's a quorum issue, these are going to be set in gold. We've been having too much and end up like we are with two members left here. So we're going to set these –

**AAG HERNBRODE:** Are these Fridays?

**CHAIR SAVINO:** Okay. The other thing I've given him – I'm giving him a list right now, guys. He can put it out and we can go from there on meetings for next year. Okay?

I believe so. I believe they're Fridays. You know I travel 200 miles one way to get here to have, you know – to worry about a quorum; and it shouldn't be that way. We need to have the people here for the meeting or do something, especially the people – you know, Bill Nash agreed that on this date he sent in that thing; and he lives in Phoenix. It just tells me that – and this is my comment

to the rest of the OHVAG members – we need to either do whatever or get off the pot. Okay? We need to – if we’re going to stay involved in this, we need to stay involved in it and look at – when Bob sends out a specific chart or whatever, we need to look at it.

One thing I do want to mention real quick before I call for an adjournment is that I’m not – I’m addressing this to the State Parks staff. I really don’t appreciate with the amount of money that’s coming into State Parks from the OHV community, okay, that we now have to print out our own agendas, our own pamphlets, the whole thing. I have all this – this entire thing is my doings. At home I print out. It used to be where we got the pamphlets.

The money hasn’t changed. We’re giving you guys money and you won’t even send it. Well, not everybody – I know Don French, for instance, he doesn’t have a printer at home. So what he has to do is download it to a disc and take it down to Quick Prints and print out something. It’s not fair when we’re putting out that much money into the system for it not to come out like that. Joy, I’m sure you have something to say on that. Oh, I can’t address that? Why, there are not enough people in the room?

**AAG HERNBRODE:** It’s not on the agenda.

**CHAIR SAVINO:** That’s not an agenda item and you can take me to court on that.

**MR. MOORE:** This is an agenda item, I feel. The special meeting that we talked about for the grant qualifications or proposals, is that going to be about our general meeting? Because I feel it would benefit us to have a meeting to only discuss that item.

**CHAIR SAVINO:** I already addressed that with Bob, that he’s going to get some time in January – it’s too late, you know, in December. Some time in January -- preferably early, middle of January that we have a meeting and it’s just specifically for those things.

**MR. MOORE:** I think that we probably could accomplish that, even on the telephone.

**CHAIR SAVINO:** Yeah, I agree.

**MR. MOORE:** I would like to do that. I think we’d get more done just to discuss that one issue.

**CHAIR SAVINO:** Well, we’re going to have two issues on the thing.

**MR. BALDWIN:** Could more people do that if we did it on a Saturday?

**CHAIR SAVINO:** Pete?

**MR. PFEIFER:** Yeah, I’m available Saturdays?

**CHAIR SAVINO:** Would it be more convenient for you to travel here to do it on a Saturday?

**MR. PFEIFER:** Yep!

**MR. McARTHUR:** Saturdays do not work for me.

**CHAIR SAVINO:** And I don't think they work for Bill because of his business right now.

**MR. BALDWIN:** Is there another weekday that's better than Friday?

**MR. McARTHUR:** Yeah, Monday.

**MR. BALDWIN:** Well we'll send out the doodle calendar and you guys let us know.

**CHAIR SAVINO:** Yeah, let's do that again. I thought it worked good except when – I guess my biggest thing is that I know we needed it here; but then it didn't – it kind of irks me – and you can say I'm not talking about – Jay, we changed this meeting to meet Jay's needs. Because he couldn't meet on the 29<sup>th</sup>; and guess what, we can't even get him to come from upstairs down here. I know he's busy, but he's dealing with a lame duck. He needs to leave her alone and come down here. She can't do him any good anymore.

**AAG HERNBRODE:** I apologize, Mr. Chairman. I have another meeting I have to go to.

**CHAIR SAVINO:** Go! Thank you very much.

**J. ADJOURNMENT @ 3:04 pm**

**CHAIR SAVINO:** I'd like to entertain a motion to adjourn this meeting.

**MR. MOORE:** I second it.

**CHAIR SAVINO:** Okay, all those in favor?

**CHORUS OF VOICES:** Aye.

**CHAIR SAVINO:** Okay, the meeting is adjourned.

**[End of meeting.]**